JUNIUS's LETTERS

TO THE

D*k*s of G*****n, and B*****d,

AND

Sir WILLIAM DRAPER, &c.

[Price One and Seven-pence Halfpenny.]

THE

POLITICAL CONTEST;

Containing, all the

LETTERS

BETWEEN

Junius and Sir William Draper:

Alſo the whole of

JUNIUS's LETTERS,

TO THE

D✱K✱S of G✱✱✱✱✱N and B✱✱✱✱✱D.

And his laſt LETTER

On the Reſcue of a GENERAL OFFICER.

When Vice prevails, and impious Men bear Sway,
The Poſt of Honour is a private Station. CATO.

The THIRD EDITION.

DUBLIN:
Printed for JAMES POTTS, at SWIFT's HEAD, in DAME-STREET. M DCC LXIX.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO THE

PUBLIC.

THE Editor apprehends that the Public will neither be ſurprized nor diſpleaſed to ſee *Junius's Letters* make their ſecond appearance in print.

THE elegance of the ſtile, the candor of the writer, and the propriety of the ſubject, at this alarming period have occaſioned many gentlemen to lament the chance of their expiring with a common News-paper. The Editor, therefore, at the earneſt entreaty of ſeveral connoiſſures in political ſubjects, is induced to reſcue them from oblivion, by thus offering to the eye of the grateful Public, a correct and authentic copy of the ſame.

ADVER-

ADVERTISEMENT.

CONFIDENT that the rare abilities and candor of the accompliſhed *Junius* would not be leſs admired in a re-publication of his patriotic letters *collectively*, than in their former *detached* and periſhing ſtate; the Editor preſumed to offer this pamphlet to the Public. The reſult has fully anſwered his expectations. It behoves him, therefore, to thank the diſcerning Public for their obliging favours, and, in gratitude, to declare, that he purpoſes to *annex*, whatever may flow from the maſterly pen of *Junius* in future, by way of *ſupplement* to this collection.

THE

THE Editor conceives, that neither the applauding Public, nor himſelf, are under any ſort of obligation to the *Monthly Reviewers*, for the "*elegant* "*invective*" againſt the envied *Junius*, which *lurks* in their laſt Number. Upon cool retroſpection, thoſe gentlemen will undoubtedly diſcover and acknowledge, that *herein* they have, *for once*, deviated from their *cuſtomary track* of CANDOR and DELICACY.

April, 12, 1769.

The EDITOR.

THE POLITICAL CONTEST.

LETTER I.

SIR,

THE ſubmiſſion of a free people to the executive authority of government is no more than a compliance with laws, which they themſelves have enacted. While the national honour is firmly maintained abroad, and while juſtice is impartially adminiſtered at home, the obedience of the ſubject will be voluntary, chearful, and I might almoſt ſay unlimited. A generous nation is grateful even for the preſervation of its rights, and willingly extends the reſpect due to the office of a good prince into an affection for his perſon. Loyalty, in the heart and underſtanding of an Engliſhman, is a national attachment to the guardian of the Laws. Prejudices and paſſion have ſometimes carried it to a criminal length; and, whatever foreigners may imagine, we know that Engliſhmen have erred as much in a miſtaken zeal for particular perſons and families, as they ever did in defence of what they thought moſt dear and intereſting to themſeves.

It naturally fills us with reſentment, to ſee ſuch a temper inſulted and abuſed. In reading the hiſtory of a free people, whoſe rights have been invaded, we are intereſted in their cauſe. Our own feelings tell us how long they ought to have ſubmitted, and at what moment it would have been treachery to them-

ſelves not to have reſiſted. How much warmer will be our reſentment, if experience ſhould bring the fatal example home to ourſelves!

The ſituation of this country is alarming enough to rouze the attention of every man, who pretends to a concern for the public welfare. Appearances juſtify ſuſpicion, and, when the ſafety of a nation is at ſtake, ſuſpicion is a juſt ground of enquiry. Let us enter into it with candour and decency. Reſpect is due to the ſtation of miniſters; and, if a reſolution muſt at laſt be taken, there is none ſo likely to be ſupported with firmneſs, as that which has been adopted with moderation.

The ruin or proſperity of a ſtate depends ſo much upon the adminiſtration of its government, that, to be acquainted with the merit of a miniſtry, we need only obſerve the condition of the people. If we ſee them obedient to the laws, proſperous in their induſtry, united at home, and reſpected abroad, we may reaſonably preſume that their affairs are conducted by men of experience, abilities and virtue. If, on the contrary, we ſee an univerſal ſpirit of diſtruſt and diſſatisfaction, a rapid decay of trade, diſſentions in all parts of the empire, and a total loſs of reſpect in the eyes of foreign powers, we may pronounce, without heſitation, that the government of that country is weak, diſtracted, and corrupt. The multitude, in all countries, are patient to a certain point. Ill-uſage may rouze their indignation, and hurry them into exceſſes, but the original fault is in government. Perhaps there never was an inſtance of a change, in the circumſtances and temper of a whole nation, ſo ſudden and extraordinary as that which the miſconduct of miniſters has, within theſe very few years, produced in Great Britain. When our gracious Sovereign aſcended the throne, we were a flouriſhing and a contented people. If the perſonal virtues of a King could have inſured the happineſs of his ſubjects, the ſcene could not have altered ſo entirely as it has done. The idea of uniting all parties,

of

of trying all characters, and diſtributing the offices of ſtate by rotation, was gracious and benevolent to an extreme, though it has not yet produced the many ſalutary effects, which was intended by it. To ſay nothing of the wiſdom of ſuch a plan, it undoubtedly aroſe from an unbounded goodneſs of heart, in which folly had no ſhare. It was not a capricious partiality to new faces;—it was not a natural turn for low intrigue; nor was it the treacherous amuſement of double and tripple negotiations. No, Sir, it aroſe from a continued anxiety in the pureſt of all poſſible hearts, for the general welfare. Unfortunately for us, the event has not been anſwerable to the deſign. After a rapid ſucceſſion of changes, we are reduced to that ſtate, which hardly any change can mend. Yet there is no extremity of diſtreſs, which of itſelf ought to reduce a great nation to deſpair. It is not the diſorder but the phyſician;—it is not a caſual concurrence of calamitous circumſtances, it is the pernicious hand of government, which alone can make a whole people deſperate.

Without much political ſagacity, or any extraordinary depth of obſervation, we need only mark how the principal departments of the ſtate are beſtowed, and look no farther for the true cauſe of every miſchief that befalls us.

The finances of a nation, ſinking under its debts and expences, are committed to a young nobleman already ruined by play. Introduced to act under the auſpices of Lord C——m, and left at the head of affairs by that nobleman's retreat, he became miniſter by accident; but deſerting the principles and profeſſions, which gave him a moment's popularity, we ſee him, from every honourable engagement to the public, an apoſtate by deſign. As for buſineſs, the world yet knows nothing of his talents or reſolution; unleſs a wayward, wavering inconſiſtency be a mark of genius, and caprice a demonſtration of ſpirit. It may be ſaid perhaps, that it is his grace's province, as ſurely it is his paſſion, rather to diſtribute than

to ſave the public money, and that Lord N—— is C——r of the E——r, the firſt Lord of the T——y may be as thoughtleſs and as extravagant as he pleaſes, I hope however he will not rely too much on the fertility of Lord N——'s genius for finance. His lordſhip is yet to give us the firſt proof of his abilities: It may be candid to ſuppoſe that he has hitherto, voluntarily, concealed his talents; intending perhaps to aſtoniſh the world, when we leaſt expect it, with a knowledge of trade, a choice of expedients, and a depth of reſources, equal to the neceſſities, and far beyond the hopes of his country. He muſt now exert the whole power of his capacity, if he would wiſh us to forget, that, ſince he has been in office, no plan has been formed, no ſyſtem adhered to, nor any one important meaſure adopted for the relief of public credit. If his plan for the ſervice of the current year be not irrevocably fixed on, let me warn him to think ſeriouſly of conſequences before he ventures to increaſe the publick debt. Outraged and oppreſſed as we are, this nation will not bear, after a ſix years peace, to ſee new millions borrowed, without any eventual diminution of debt, or reduction of intereſt. The attempt might rouze a ſpirit of reſentment, which might reach beyond the ſacrifice of a miniſter. As to the debt upon the civil liſt, the people of England expect that it will not be paid without a ſtrict enquiry how it was incurred. If it muſt be paid by parliament, let me adviſe the C——r of the E———r to think of ſome better expedient than a lottery. To ſupport an expenſive war, or in circumſtances of abſolute neceſſity; a lottery may perhaps be allowable; but, beſides that is at all times the very worſt way of raiſing money upon the people, I think it ill becomes the R—l dignity to have the debts of a ——— provided for, like the repairs of a country bridge or a decayed hoſpital. The management of the K—g's affairs in the H— of C—— cannot be more diſgraced than it has been. A leading miniſter repeatedly called down for abſolute igno-

rance

rance ; — ridiculous motions ridiculouſly withdrawn ; —deliberate plans diſconcerted, and a week's preparation of graceful oratory loſt in a moment, give us ſome, though not adequate idea of Lord N———'s parliamentary abilities and influence. Yet before he had the misfortune of being C—— of the E——r, he was neither an object of deriſion to his enemies nor of melancholy pity to his friends.

A ſeries of inconſiſtent meaſures had alienated the colonies from their duty as ſubjects, and from their natural affection to their common country. When Mr. Grenville was placed at the head of the T——y, he felt the impoſſibility of Great Britain's ſupporting ſuch an eſtabliſhment as her former ſucceſſes had made indiſputable, and at the ſame time of giving any ſenſible relief to foreign trade and to the weight of the public debt. He thought it equitable that thoſe parts of the empire, which had benefited moſt by the expences of the war, ſhould contribute ſomething to the expences of the peace, and he had no doubt of the conſtitutional right veſted in parliament to raiſe the contribution. But unfortunately for this country, Mr. Grenville was at any rate to be diſtreſſed becauſe he was miniſter, and Mr. P—t and Lord C———n were to be patrons of America, becauſe they were in oppoſition. Their declaration gave ſpirit and argument to the colonies, and while perhaps they meant no more than a ruin of a miniſter, they in effect divided one half of the empire from the other.

Under one adminiſtration the ſtamp act is made, under the ſecond it is repealed, under the third, in ſpite of all experience, a new mode of taxing the colonies is invented, and a queſtion revived, which ought to have been buried in oblivion. In theſe circumſtances a new office is eſtabliſhed for the buſineſs of the plantations, and the Earl of H———h called forth, at a moſt critical ſeaſon, to govern America. The choice at leaſt announced to us a man of ſuperior capacity and knowledge. Whether he be ſo or not, let his diſpatches as far as they have appeared, let his

meaſures

meaſures as far as they have operated, determine for him. In the former we have ſeen ſtrong aſſertions without proof, declamation without argument, and violent cenſures without dignity or moderation; but neither correctneſs in the compoſition, nor judgment in the deſign. As for his meaſures, let it be remembered that he was called upon to conciliate and unite; and that when he entered into office, the moſt refractory of the colonies were ſtill diſpoſed to proceed by the conſtitutional methods of petition and remonſtrance. Since that period they have been driven into exceſſes little ſhort of rebellion. Petitions have been hindered from reaching the throne; and the continuance of one of the principal aſſemblies put upon an arbitrary condition, which, conſidering the temper they were in, it was impoſſible they ſhould comply with, and which would have availed nothing as to the general queſtion if it had been complied with. So violent, and I believe I may call it ſo unconſtitutional an exertion of the prerogative, to ſay nothing of the weak, injudicious terms in which it was conveyed, give us as humble an opinion of his lordſhip's capacity, as it does of his temper and moderation. While we are at peace with other nations, our military force may perhaps be ſpared to ſupport the Earl of H—-h's meaſures in America. Whenever that force ſhall be neceſſarily withdrawn or diminiſhed, the diſmiſſion of ſuch a miniſter will neither conſole *us* for his imprudence, nor remove the ſettled reſentment of a people, who, complaining of an act of the legiſlature, are outraged by an unwarrantable ſtretch of prerogative, and, ſupporting their claims by argument, are inſulted with declamation.

Drawing lots would be a prudent and reaſonable method of appointing the officers of ſtate, compared to a late diſpoſition of the ſecretary's office. Lord R——d was acquainted with the affairs and temper of the ſouthern courts: Lord W——h was equally qualified for either department. By what unaccountable caprice has it happened, that the latter, who

who pretends to no experience whatſoever, is removed to the moſt important of the two departments, and the former by preference placed in an office, where his experience can be of no uſe to him? Lord W———h had diſtinguiſhed himſelf in his firſt employment by a ſpirited, if not judicious conduct. He had animated the civil magiſtrate beyond the tone of civil authority, and had directed the operations of the army to more than military execution. Recovered from the errors of his youth, from the diſtraction of play, and the bewitching ſmiles of Burgundy, behold him exerting the whole ſtrength of his clear, unclouded faculties in the ſervice of the crown. It was not the heat of midnight exceſſes, nor ignorance of the laws, nor the furious ſpirit of the houſe of B——d: No, Sir, when this reſpectable miniſter interpoſed his authority between the magiſtrate and the people, and ſigned the mandate, on which for ought he knew, the lives of thouſands depend, he did it from the deliberate motion of his heart, ſupported by the beſt of his judgment.

It has lately been a faſhion to pay a compliment to the bravery and generoſity of the c——r in ch——, at the expence of his underſtanding. They who love him leaſt make no queſtion of his courage, while his friends dwell chiefly on the facility of his diſpoſition. Admitting him to be as brave as a total abſence of all feeling and reflexion can make him, let us ſee what ſort of merit he derives from the remainder of his character. If it be generoſity to accumulate in his own perſon and family a number of lucrative employments; to provide at the public expence, for every creature that bears the name of M——rs; and neglecting the merit and ſervices of the reſt of the army, to heap promotions upon his favorites and dependants, the preſent c———r in ch——— is the moſt generous man alive. Nature has been ſparing of her gifts to this noble lord; but where birth and fortune are united, we expect the noble pride and independance of a man of ſpirit, not

the

the ſervile, humiliating complaiſance of a courtier. As to the goodneſs of his heart, if a proof of it be taken from the facility of never refuſing, what concluſion ſhall we draw from the indecency of never performing? And if the diſcipline of the army be in any degree preſerved, what thanks are due to a man, whoſe cares, notoriouſly confined to filling up vacancies, have degraded the office of c---------r in ch------- into a broker of commiſſions.

With reſpect to the navy, I ſhall only ſay, that this country is ſo highly indebted to Sir Edward Hawke, that no expence ſhould be ſpared to ſecure him an honourable and affluent retreat.

The pure and impartial adminiſtration of juſtice is perhaps the firmeſt bond to ſecure a chearful ſubmiſſion of the people, and to engage their affections to government. It is not ſufficient that queſtions of private right or wrong are juſtly decided, nor that judges are ſuperior to the vileneſs of pecuniary corruption. Jefferies himſelf when the court had no intereſt was an upright Judge. A court of juſtice may be ſubject to another ſort of bias, more important and pernicious, as it reaches beyond the intereſt of individuals, and affects the whole community.—A judge, under the influence of government, may be honeſt enough in the deciſion of private cauſes, yet a traitor to the public. When a victim is marked out by the miniſtry, this judge will offer himſelf to perform the ſacrifice. He will not ſcruple to proſtitute his dignity, and betray the ſanctity of his office, whenever an arbitrary point is to be carried for g------t, or the reſentment of a c-----t to be gratified.

Theſe principles and proceedings, odious and contemptible as they are, in effect are no leſs injudicious. A wiſe and generous people are rouſed by every appearance of oppreſſive, unconſtitutional meaſures, whether thoſe meaſures are ſupported openly by the power of g------t, or maſked under the forms of a c-----t of j---ſt---e. Prudence and ſelf-preſervation

vation will oblige the moſt moderate diſpoſitions to make common cauſe, even with a man whoſe conduct they cenſure, if they ſee him perſecuted in a way which the real ſpirit of the laws will not juſtify. The facts, on which theſe marks are founded, are too notorious to require an application.

This, Sir, is the detail. In one view, behold, a nation overwhelmed with debt;—her revenues waſted;—her trade declining;—the affections of her colonies alienated;---the duty of the magiſtrate tranſferred to the ſoldiery;---a gallant army, which never fought unwillingly but againſt their fellow ſubjects, mouldering away for want of the direction of a man of common abilities and ſpirit;---and, in the laſt inſtance, the adminiſtration of juſtice become odious and ſuſpected to the whole body of the people. This deplorable ſcene admits but of one addition,---that we are governed by counſels, from which a reaſonable man can expect no remedy but poiſon, no relief but death.

If by the immediate interpoſition of providence it were poſſible for us to eſcape a criſis ſo full of terror and deſpair, poſterity will not believe the hiſtory of the preſent times. They will either conclude that our diſtreſſes were imaginary, or that we had the good fortune to be governed by men of acknowledged integrity and wiſdom: They will not believe it poſſible that their anceſtors could have ſurvived, or recovered from ſo deſperate a condition, while a Duke of G——n was prime miniſter,---a Lord N—— chancellor of the exchequer,---a W———th and a H——h ſecretaries of ſtate,---a G———y commander in chief,---and a ——— chief criminal judge of the kingdom.

JUNIUS.

April 21, 1769.

LETTER II.

SIR,

THE kingdom ſwarms with ſuch numbers of felonious robbers of private character and vertue, that no honeſt or good man is ſafe; eſpecially as theſe cowardly baſe aſſaſſins ſtab in the dark, without having the courage to ſign their real names to their malevolent and wicked productions. A writer, who ſigns himſelf Junius, in the Public Advertiſer of the 31ſt inſtant, opens the deplorable ſituation of his country in a very affecting manner; with a pompous parade of his candour and decency, he tells us that we ſee diſſentions in all parts of the empire, and univerſal ſpirit of diſtruſt and diſſatisfaction, and a total loſs of reſpect towards us in the eyes of foreign powers. But this writer, with all his boaſted candour, has not told us the real cauſe of the evils he ſo pathetically enumerates. I ſhall take the liberty to explain the cauſe for him. Junius, and ſuch writers as himſelf, occaſion all the miſchief complained of, by falſely and maliciouſly traducing the beſt characters in the kingdom. For when our deluded people at home, and foreigners abroad, read the poiſonous and inflammatory libels that are daily publiſhed with impunity, to vilify thoſe who are any way diſtinguiſhed by their good qualities and eminent virtues; when they find no notice taken of, or reply given to theſe ſlanderous tongues and pens, their concluſion is, that both the miniſters and the nation have been fairly deſcribed, and they act accordingly. I think it therefore the duty of every good citizen to ſtand forth, and endeavour to undeceive the public, when the vileſt arts are made uſe of to defame and blacken the brighteſt characters among us. An eminent author affirms it to be almoſt as criminal to hear a worthy man traduced, without attempting his juſtification, as to be the author of the calumny againſt him.

him. For my own part, I think it a ſort of miſpriſion of treaſon againſt ſociety. No man therefore who knows Lord Granby, can poſſibly hear ſo good and great a character moſt vilely abuſed, without a warm and juſt indignation againſt this Junius, this high-prieſt of envy, malice, and all uncharitableneſs, who has endeavoured to ſacrifice our beloved commander in chief at the altars of his horrid deities. Nor is the injury done to his lordſhip alone, but to the whole nation, which may too ſoon feel the contempt, and conſequently the attacks of our late enemies, if they can be induced to believe that the perſon to whom the ſafety of theſe kingdoms ſo much depends, is unequal to his high ſtation, and deſtitute of thoſe qualities which form a good General. One would have thought that his lordſhip's ſervices in the cauſe of his country, from the battle of Culloden to his moſt glorious concluſion of the late war, might have entitled him to common reſpect and decency at leaſt; but this uncandid indecent writer, has gone ſo far, as to turn one of the moſt amiable men of the age into a ſtupid, unfeeling, and ſenſeleſs being; poſſeſſed indeed of a perſonal courage, but void of thoſe eſſential qualities which diſtinguiſh the commander from the common ſoldier.

A very long, uninterrupted, impartial, I will add, a moſt diſintereſted friendſhip with Lord Granby, gives me the right to affirm, that all Junius's aſſertions are falſe and ſcandalous. Lord Granby's courage, tho' of the brighteſt and moſt ardent kind, is among the loweſt of his numerous good qualities; he was formed to excel in war by nature's liberality to his mind as well as perſon. Educated and inſtructed by his moſt noble father, and a moſt ſpirited as well as excellent ſcholar, the preſent Biſhop of bangor, he was trained to the niceſt ſenſe of honour, and to the trueſt and nobleſt ſort of pride, that of never doing or ſuffering a mean action. A ſincere love and attachment to his king and country, and to their glory, firſt impelled him to the field, where he never gained ought but honour. He impaired, through his bounty, his own

fortune; for his bounty, which this writer would in vain depreciate, is founded upon the nobleſt of the human affections, it flows from a heart melting to goodneſs from the moſt refined humanity. Can a man who is deſcribed as unfeeling, and void of reflection, be conſtantly employed in ſeeking proper objects on whom to exerciſe thoſe glorious virtues of compaſſion and generoſity? The diſtreſſed officer, the ſoldier, the widow, the orphan, and a long liſt beſides, know that vanity has no ſhare in his frequent donations; he gives, becauſe he feels their diſtreſſes. Nor has he ever been rapacious with one hand to be bountiful with the other; yet this uncandid Junius would inſinuate, that the dignity of the commander in chief is depraved into the baſe office of a commiſſion broker; that is, Lord Granby bargains for the ſale of commiſſions; for it muſt have this meaning, if it has any at all. But where is the man living who can juſtly charge his lordſhip with ſuch mean practices? Why does not Junius produce him? Junius knows that he has no other means of wounding this hero, than from ſome miſſile weapon, ſhot from an obſcure corner; He ſeeks, as all ſuch defamatory writers do,

——— *ſpargere voces*
In Vulgum ambiguas ———

to raiſe ſuſpicion in the minds of the people. But I hope that my countrymen will be no longer impoſed upon by artful and deſigning men, or by wretches, who, bankrupts in buſineſs, in fame and in fortune, mean nothing more than to involve this country in the ſame common ruin with themſelves. Hence it is, that they are conſtantly aiming their dark and too often fatal weapons againſt thoſe who ſtand forth as the bulwark of our national ſafety. Lord Granby was too conſpicuous a mark not to be their object. He is next attacked for being unfaithful to his promiſes and engagements: Where are Junius's proofs? Although I could give ſome inſtances, where a breach of promiſe would be a virtue, eſpecially in the caſe of thoſe who would pervert the open, unſuſpecting

pecting moments of convivial mirth, into ſly, inſidu-ous applications for preferment, or party ſyſtems, and would endeavour to ſurprize a good man, who can-not bear to ſee any one leave him diſſatisfied, into unguarded promiſes. L—d G—by's attention to his own family and relations, is called ſelfiſh. Had he not attended to them, when fair and juſt opportuni-ties preſented themſelves, I ſhould have thought him unfeeling, and void of reflection indeed. How are any man's friends or relations to be provided for, but from the influence and protection of the patron? It is unfair to ſuppoſe that Lord Granby's friends have not as much merit as the friends of any other great man: If he is generous at the public expence, as Junius inviduouſly calls it, the public is at no more expence for his lordſhip's friends, than it would be, if any other ſet of men poſſeſſed thoſe offices. The charge is ridiculous!

The laſt charge againſt Lord Granby is of a moſt ſerious and alarming nature indeed. Junius aſſerts, that the army is mouldering away for want of the direction of a man of common abilities and ſpirit. The preſent condition of the army gives the directeſt lie to his aſſertions. It was never upon a more re-ſpectable footing with regard to diſcipline, and all the eſſentials that can form good ſoldiers. Lord Ligonier delivered a firm and noble palladium of our ſafeties into Lord Granby's hands, who has kept it in the ſame good order in which he received it. The ſtricteſt care has been taken to fill up the vacant commiſſions with ſuch gentlemen as have the glory of their ancef-tors to ſupport, as well as their own, and are doubly bound to the cauſe of their King and country, from motives of private property, as well as public ſpirit. The adjutant general, who has the immediate care of the troops, after Lord Granby, is an officer who would do great honour to any ſervice in Europe, for his correct arrangements, good ſenſe and diſcernment upon all occaſions, and for a punctuality and preciſion which give the moſt entire ſatisfaction to all who are

obliged

obliged to conſult him. The reviewing generals, who inſpect the army twice a year, have been ſelected with the greateſt care, and have anſwered the important truſt repoſed in them in the moſt laudable manner. Their reports of the condition of the army are much more to be credited than thoſe of Junius, whom I do adviſe to atone for his ſhameful aſperſions, by aſking pardon of Lord Granby, and the whole kingdom, whom he has offended by his abominable ſcandals. In ſhort, to turn Junius's own battery againſt him, I muſt aſſert in his own words, "that he has given ſtrong aſſertions without proof, declamation without argument, and violent cenſures without dignity or moderation."

Jan. 26, 1769. WILLIAM DRAPER.

LETTER III.

To Sir WILLIAM DRAPER, KNIGHT *of the* BATH.

SIR,

YOUR defence of Lord G——y does honour to the goodneſs of your heart. You feel, as you ought to do, for the reputation of your friend, and you expreſs yourſelf in the warmeſt language of the paſſions. In any other cauſe, I doubt not, you would have cautiouſly weighed the conſequences of committing your name to the licentious diſcourſes and malignant opinions of the world. But here, I preſume, you thought it would be a breach of friendſhip to loſe one moment in conſulting your underſtanding; as if an appeal to the public were no more than a military *coup de main*, where a brave man has no rules to follow, but the dictates of his courage. Touched with your generoſity, I freely forgive the exceſſes into which it has led you; and, far from reſenting thoſe terms of reproach, which, conſi-

conſidering that you are an advocate for decorum, you have heaped upon me rather too liberally, I place them to the account of an honeſt unreflecting indignation, in which your cooler judgment and natural politeneſs had no concern. I approve of the ſpirit, with which you have given your name to the public; and, if it were a proof of any thing but ſpirit, I ſhould have thought myſelf bound to follow your example. I ſhould have hoped that even *my* name might carry ſome authority with it, if I had not ſeen how very little weight or conſideration a printed paper receives, even from the reſpectable ſignature of Sir William Draper.

You begin with a general aſſertion that writers, ſuch as I am, are the real cauſe of all the public evils we complain of. And do you really think, Sir William, that the licentious pen of a political writer is able to produce ſuch important effects? A little calm reflection might have ſhewn you, that national calamities do not ariſe from the deſcription, but from the real character and conduct of miniſters. To have ſupported your aſſertion, you ſhould have proved that the preſent miniſtry are unqueſtionably the *beſt and righteſt* characters of the kingdom; and that, if the affections of the colonies have been alienated, if Corſica has been ſhamefully abandoned, if commerce languiſhes, if public credit is threatened with a new debt, and your own Manilla ranſom moſt diſhonourably given up, it has all been owing to the malice of political writers, who will not ſuffer the beſt and brighteſt of characters (meaning ſtill the preſent miniſtry) to take a ſingle right ſtep for the honour or intereſt of the nation. But it ſeems you were a little tender of coming to particulars. Your conſcience inſinuated to you, that it would be prudent to leave the characters of G——, N——th, H——gh, W——th, and M——d, to ſhift for themſelves; and truly, Sir William, the part you *have* undertaken is at leaſt as much as you are equal to.

With-

Without diſputing Lord G——'s courage, we are yet to learn in what articles of military knowledge nature has been ſo very liberal to his mind. If you have ſerved with him, you ought to have pointed out ſome inſtances of able diſpoſition and well concerted enterpriſe, which might fairly be attributed to his capacity as a General. It is you, Sir William, who make your friend appear aukward and ridiculous, by giving him a laced ſuit of tawdry qualifications, which nature never intended him to wear.

You ſay, he has acquired nothing but honour in the field. Is the ordnance nothing? Are the blues nothing? Is the command of the army, with all the patronage annexed to it, nothing? Where he got theſe *nothings* I know not; but you at leaſt ought to have told us where he deſerved them.

As to his bounty, compaſſion, &c. it would have been but little to the purpoſe, though you had proved all that you have aſſerted. I meddle with nothing but his character as c--------r in c-----; and though I acquit him of the baſeneſs of ſelling commiſſions, I ſtill aſſert that his military cares have never extended beyond the diſpoſal of vacancies; and I am juſtified by the complaints of the whole army, when I ſay that, in this diſtribution, he conſults nothing but p-----y intereſts, or the gratification of his immediate dependants. As to his ſervile ſubmiſſion to the reigning miniſtry, let me aſk, whether he did not deſert the cauſe of the whole army, when he ſuffered Sir Jeffery Amherſt to be ſacrificed, and what ſhare he had in recalling that officer to the ſervice. Did he not betray the juſt intereſt of the army, in permitting Lord P---y to have a regiment? and does he not at this moment give up all character and dignity as a gentleman, in receding from his own repeated declarations in favour of Mr. Wilkes.

In the two next articles I think we are agreed. You candidly admit, that he often makes ſuch promiſes as it is a virtue in him to violate, and that no man is more aſſiduous to provide for his relations at

the

the public expence. I did not urge the laſt as an abſolute vice in his diſpoſition, but to prove that a *careleſs diſintereſted ſpirit* is no part of his character; and as to the other, I deſire it may be remembered that *I* never deſcended to the indecency of inquiring into his *convivial hours*. It is you, Sir William Draper, who have taken pains to repreſent your friend in the character of a drunken landlord, who deals out his promiſes as liberally as his liquor, and will ſuffer no man to leave his table either ſorrowful or ſober. None but an intimate friend, who muſt frequently have ſeen him in theſe unhappy, diſgraceful moments, could have deſcribed him ſo well.

The laſt charge, of the neglect of the army, is indeed the moſt material of all. I am ſorry to tell you, Sir William, that, in this article, your firſt fact is falſe, and as there is nothing more painful to me than to give a direct contradiction to a gentleman of your appearance, I could wiſh that, in your future publications, you would pay a greater attention to the truth of your premiſes, before you ſuffer your genius to hurry you to a concluſion. Lord Ligonier *did not* deliver the army (which you, in a claſſical language, are pleaſed to call a Palladium) into Lord G——by's hands. It was taken from him, much againſt his inclination, ſome two or three years before Lord G——y was commander in chief. As to the ſtate of the army, I ſhould be glad to know, where you have received your intelligence. Was it in the rooms at Bath, or at your retreat at Clifton? The reports of reviewing Generals comprehend only a few regiments in England, which, as they are immediately under the royal inſpection, are perhaps in ſome tolerable order. But do you know any thing of the troops in the Weſt Indies, the Mediterranean, and North America, to ſay nothing of a whole army abſolutely ruined in Ireland? Inquire a little into facts, Sir William, before you publiſh your next panegyric upon Lord G-----y, and believe me you will find there is a fault at head quarters, which even the ac-

knowledged care and abilities of the Adjutant General cannot correct.

Permit me now, Sir William, to addreſs myſelf perſonally to you, by way of thanks for the honour of your correſpondence. You are by no means undeſerving of notice; and it may be of conſequence even to Lord G-------y to have it determined, whether or no the man who has praiſed him ſo laviſhly, be himſelf deſerving of praiſe. When you returned to Europe, you zealouſly undertook the cauſe of that gallant army, by whoſe bravery at Manilla your own fortunes had been eſtabliſhed. You complained, you threatened, you even appealed to the public in print. By what accident did it happen, that in the midſt of all this buſtle, and all theſe clamours for juſtice to your injured troops, the name of the Manilla ranſom was ſuddenly buried in a profound, and, ſince that time, an uninterrupted ſilence? Did the miniſtry ſuggeſt any motives to you, ſtrong enough to tempt a man of honour to deſert and betray the cauſe of his fellow ſoldiers? Was it that bluſhing ribband, which is now the perpetual ornament of your perſon? or was it that regiment, which you afterwards (a thing unprecedented among ſoldiers) ſold to Colonel Giſborne? or was it that government, the full pay of which you are contented to hold, with the half-pay of an Iriſh Colonel? And do you now, after a retreat not very like that of Scipio, preſume to intrude yourſelf, unthought of, uncalled for, upon the patience of the public? Are your flatteries of the c-------r in ch---- directed to another regiment, which you may again diſpoſe of on the ſame honourable terms? We know your prudence, Sir William, and I ſhould be ſorry to ſtop your preferment.

JUNIUS.

LET-

LETTER IV.

To JUNIUS.

SIR,

I Received Junius's favour laſt night; he is determined to keep his advantage by the help of his maſk; it is an excellent protection, it has ſaved many a man from an untimely end. But whenever he will be honeſt enough to lay it aſide, avow himſelf, and produce the face which has ſo long lurked behind it, the world will be able to judge of his motives for writing ſuch infamous invectives. His real name will diſcover his freedom and independency, or his ſervility to a faction. Diſappointed ambition, reſentment for defeated hopes, and deſire of revenge, aſſume but too often the appearance of public ſpirit; but be his deſigns wicked or charitable, Junius ſhould learn that it is poſſible to condemn meaſures, without a barbarous and criminal outrage againſt men. Junius delights to mangle carcaſes with a hatchet; his language and inſtrument have a great connection with Clare-market, and to do him juſtice, he handles his weapon moſt admirably. One would imagine he had been taught to throw it by the ſavages of America. It is therefore high time for me to ſtep in once more to ſhield my friend from this mercileſs weapon, altho' I may be wounded in the attempt. But I muſt firſt aſk Junius, by what forced analogy and conſtruction the moments of convivial mirth are made to ſignify indecency, a violation of engagements, a drunken landlord, and a deſire that every one in company ſhould be drunk likewiſe? He muſt have called all the flowers of St. Giles's and Billingſgate to have produced ſuch a piece of oratory. Here the hatchet deſcends with ten-fold vengeance; but, alas! it hurts no one but its maſter! For Junius muſt not think to put words into my mouth that ſeem too foul even for his own.

My friend's political engagements I know not, ſo cannot pretend to explain them, or aſſert their conſiſtency,

ſiſtency. I know not whether Junius be conſiderable enough to belong to any party; if he ſhould be ſo, can he affirm that he has always adhered to one ſet of men and meaſures? Is he ſure that he has never ſided with thoſe whom he was firſt hired to abuſe? Has he never abuſed thoſe he was hired to praiſe? To ſay the truth, moſt men's politics ſit much too looſely about them. But as my friend's military character was the chief object that engaged me in this controverſy, to that I ſhall return.

Junius aſks what inſtances my friend has given of his military ſkill and capacity as a General? When and where he gained his honour? When he deſerved his emolument? The united voice of the army which ſerved under him, the glorious teſtimony of Prince Ferdinand, and of vanquiſhed enemies, all Germany will tell him. Junius repeats the complaints of the army againſt p----------y influence. I love the army too well, not to wiſh that ſuch influence were leſs. Let Junius point out the time when it has not prevailed. It was of the leaſt force in the time of that great man, the late Duke of Cumberland, who, as a prince of the blood, was able as well as willing to ſtem a torrent which would have overborne any private ſubject. In time of war this influence is ſmall. In peace, when diſcontent and faction have the ſureſt means to operate, eſpecially in this country, and when, from a ſcarcity of public ſpirit, the wheels of government are rarely moved, but by the power and force of obligations, its weight is always too great: Yet, if this influence at preſent has done no greater harm, than the placing Earl Percy at the head of a regiment, I do not think that either the rights or beſt intereſts of the army are ſacrificed and betrayed, or the nation undone. Let me aſk Junius, if he knows any one nobleman in the army, who has had a regiment by ſeniority? I feel myſelf happy in ſeeing young noblemen of illuſtrious name and great property come among us. They are an additional ſecurity to the

kingdom

kingdom from foreign or domeſtic ſlavery. Junius needs not be told, that ſhould the time ever come, when this nation is to be defended only by thoſe, who have nothing more to loſe than their arms and their pay, its danger will be great indeed! A happy mixture of men of quality with ſoldiers of fortune is always to be wiſhed for. But the main point is ſtill to be contended for, I mean the diſcipline and condition of the army; and I ſtill muſt maintain, though contradicted by Junius, that it was never upon a more reſpectable footing, to all the eſſentials that can form good ſoldiers, than it is at preſent. Junius is forced to allow that our army at home may be in ſome tolerable order; yet how kindly does he invite our late enemies to the invaſion of Ireland, by aſſuring them that the army in that kingdom is totally ruined! (The colonels of that army are much obliged to him.) I have too great an opinion of the military talents of the lord lieutenant, and of all their diligence and capacity, to believe it. If from ſome ſtrange, unaccountable fatality, the people of that kingdom cannot be induced to conſult their own ſecurity, by ſuch an effectual augmentation, as may enable the troops there to act with power and energy, is the commander in chief here to blame? Or is he to blame, becauſe the troops in the Mediterranean, in the Weſt Indies, in America, labour under great difficulties from the ſcarcity of men, which is but too viſible all over theſe kingdoms? Many of our forces are in climates unfavourable to Britiſh conſtitutions, their loſs is in proportion. Britain muſt recruit all theſe regiments from her own emaciated boſom, or more precariouſly, by Catholicks from Ireland. We are likewiſe ſubject to the fatal drains to the Eaſt Indies, to Senegal, and the alarming emigrations of our people to other countries: Such depopulation can only be repaired by a long peace, or by ſome ſenſible bill of naturalization.

I muſt now take the liberty to talk to Junius on my own account. He is pleaſed to tell me that he addreſſes himſelf to me *perſonally*. I ſhall be glad to

ſee

ſee him. It is his *Perſonality* that I complain of, and his inviſible attacks; for his dagger in the air is only to be regarded, becauſe one cannot ſee the hand which holds it; but had he not wounded other people more deeply than myſelf, I ſhould have not obtruded myſelf at all on the patience of the public.

Mark how a plain tale ſhall put him down, and transfuſe the bluſh of my ribband into his own cheeks. Junius tells me, that at my return, I zealouſly undertook the cauſe of the gallant army, by whoſe bravery at Manilla my own fortunes were eſtabliſhed; that I complained, that I even appealed to the public. I did ſo; I glory in having done ſo, as I had an undoubted right to vindicate my own character, attacked by a Spaniſh memorial, and to aſſert the rights of my brave companions. I glory likewiſe that I have never taken up my pen, but to vindicate the injured. Junius aſks by what accident did it happen, that in the midſt of all this buſtle, and all the clamours for juſtice to the injured troops, the Manilla ranſom was ſuddenly buried in a profound, and ſince that time, an uninterrupted ſilence? I will explain the cauſe to the public. The ſeveral miniſters who have been employed ſince that time have been very deſirous to do juſtice from two moſt laudable motives, a ſtrong inclination to aſſiſt injured bravery, and to acquire a well deſerved popularity to themſelves. Their efforts have been in vain. Some were ingenious enough to own, that they could not think of involving this diſtreſſed nation into another war for our private concerns. In ſhort, our rights, for the preſent, are ſacrificed to national convenience; and I muſt confeſs, that although I may loſe five-and-twenty thouſand pounds by their acquieſcence to this breach of faith to the Spaniards, I think they are in the right to temporize, conſidering the critical ſituation of this country, convulſed in every part by poiſon infuſed by anonymous, wicked, and incendiary writers. Lord Shelburne will do me the juſtice to own, that, in September laſt, I waited upon him

with

with a joint memorial from the Admiral Sir S Corniſh and myſelf, in behalf of our injured companions. His lordſhip was as frank upon the occaſion as other ſecretaries had been before him. He did not deceive us by giving any immediate hopes of relief.

Junius would baſely inſinuate, that my ſilence may have been purchaſed by my government, by my *bluſhing* ribband, by my regiment, by the ſale of that regiment, and by half pay as an Iriſh colonel.

His majeſty was pleaſed to give me my government, for my ſervice at Madras. I had my firſt regiment in 1757. Upon my return from Manilla, his majeſty, by Lord Egremont, informed me, that I ſhould have the firſt vacant red ribband, as a reward for my ſervices in an enterprize, which I had planned as well as executed. The Duke of Bedford and Mr. Grenville confirmed thoſe aſſurances many months before the Spaniards had proteſted the ranſom bills. To accommodate Lord Clive, then going upon a moſt important ſervice to Bengal, I waved my claim to the vacancy which then happened. As there was no other vacancy until the Duke of Grafton and Lord Rockingham were joint miniſters, I was then honoured with the order, and it is ſurely no ſmall honour to me, that in ſuch a ſucceſſion of miniſters, they were all pleaſed to think that I had deſerved it; in my favour they were all united. Upon the reduction of the 79th regiment, which had ſerved ſo glorioufly in the Eaſt Indies, his majeſty, unſolicited by me, gave me the 16th of foot as an equivalent. My motives for retiring afterwards are foreign to the purpoſe; let it ſuffice, that his majeſty was pleaſed to approve of them; they are ſuch as no man can think indecent, who knows the ſhocks that repeated viciſſitudes of heat and cold, of dangerous and ſickly climates, will give to the beſt conſtitutions in a pretty long courſe of ſervice. I reſigned my regiment to Colonel Giſborne, a very good officer, for his half pay, 1200*l.* Iriſh annuity; ſo that, according to Junius, I have been bribed to ſay nothing more of the

Manilla

Manilla ranſom, and ſacrifice thoſe brave men by the ſtrange avarice of accepting three hundred and eighty pounds per ann. and giving up eight hundred! If this be bribery, it is not the bribery of theſe times. As to my flattery, thoſe who know me will judge of it. By the aſperity of Junius's ſtile, I cannot indeed call him a flatterer, unleſs it be as a cynick or a maſtiff; if he wags his tail, he will ſtill growl, and long to bite. The public will now judge of the credit that ought to be given to Junius's writings, from the falſities that he has inſinuated with reſpect to myſelf.

WILLIAM DRAPER.

LETTER V.

To Sir WILLIAM DRAPER, KNIGHT of the BATH.

SIR,

I Should juſtly be ſuſpected of acting upon motives of more than common enmity to Lord G——y, if I continue to give you freſh materials or occaſion for writing in his defence. Individuals who hate, and the public who deſpiſe, have read *your* Letters, Sir William, with infinitely more ſatisfaction than mine. Unfortunately for him, his reputation, like that unhappy country, to which you refer me for his laſt military atchievements, has ſuffered more by his friends than his enemies. In mercy to him, let us drop the ſubject. For my own part, I willingly leave it to the public to determine whether your vindication of your friend has been as able and judicious, as it was certainly well intended; and you, I think, may be ſatisfied with the warm acknowledgments he already owes you for making him the principal figure in a piece, in which, but for your amicable aſſiſtance, he

he might have paſſed without particular notice of diſtinction.

In juſtice to your friends, let your future labours be confined to the care of your own reputation. Your declaration, that you are happy in ſeeing young noblemen *come among us*, is liable to two objections. With reſpect to Lord P——y, it means nothing, for he was already in the army. He was aid de camp to the King, and had the rank of colonel. A regiment therefore could not make him a more military man, though it made him richer, and probably at the expence of ſome brave, deſerving, friendleſs officer.—The other concerns himſelf. After ſelling the companions of your victory in one inſtance, and after ſelling your profeſſion in the other, by what authority do you preſume to call yourſelf a ſoldier? The plain evidence of facts is ſuperior to all declarations. Before you were appointed to the 16th regiment, your complaints were a diſtreſs to government;—from that moment you were ſilent. The concluſion is inevitable. You inſinuate to us that your ill ſtate of health obliged you to quit the ſervice. The retirement neceſſary to repair a broken conſtitution would have been as good a reaſon for not accepting, as for reſigning the command of a regiment. There is certainly an error of the preſs, or an affected obſcurity in that paragraph, where you ſpeak of your bargain with colonel Giſborne. Inſtead of attempting to anſwer what I really do not underſtand, permit me to explain to the public what I really know. In exchange for your regiment, you accepted of a colonel's half pay (at leaſt 220l. a year) and an annuity of 200l. for your own and lady Draper's life jointly.—And this is the loſing bargain, which you would repreſent to us, as if you had given up an income of 800l. a year for 380l? Was it decent, was it honourable, in a man who pretends to love the army, and calls himſelf a ſoldier, to make a traffic of the royal favour, and to turn the higheſt honour of an active profeſſion into a ſordid proviſion for himſelf and his

family? It were unworthy of me to preſs you farther, The contempt, with which the whole army heard of the manner of your retreat, aſſures me that as your conduct was not juſtified by precedent, it will never be thought an example for imitation.

The laſt and moſt important queſtion remains. When you receive your half pay, do you, or do you not, take a ſolemn oath, or ſign a declaration upon honour to the following effect? *That you do not actually hold any place of profit, civil or military, under his Majeſty.* The charge which the queſtion plainly conveys againſt you, is of ſo ſhocking a complexion, that I ſincerely wiſh you may be able to anſwer it well, not merely for the colour of your reputation, but for your own inward peace of mind.

JUNIUS.

P. S. I had determined to leave the C——r in Ch—— in the quiet enjoyment of his friend and his bottle; but Titus deſerves an anſwer, and ſhall have a complete one.

LETTER VI.

To JUNIUS.

SIR,

I Have a very ſhort anſwer for Junius's queſtion: I do not either take an oath, or declare upon honour, that I have no *place* of profit *civil* or military, when I receive the half pay as an Iriſh colonel. My moſt gracious Sovereign gives it me as a penſion; he was pleaſed to think I deſerved it. The annuity of 200l. Iriſh, and the equivalent for the half pay together, produces no more than 380l. per annum clear of fees and perquiſites of office. I receive 167l. from my government of Yarmouth. Total 547l.

per

per annum. My conſcience is much at eaſe in theſe particulars; my friends need not bluſh for me.

Junius makes much and frequent uſe of interrogations: they are arms that may be eaſily turned againſt himſelf. I could by malicious interrogation diſturb the peace of the moſt virtuous man in the kingdom; I could take the decalogue, and ſay to one man, Did you never ſteal? To the next, Did you never commit murder? And to Junius himſelf, who is putting my life and conduct to the rack, Did you never bear falſe witneſs againſt thy neighbour? Junius muſt eaſily ſee, that unleſs he affirms to the contrary in his real name, ſome people who may be as ignorant of him as I am, will be apt to ſuſpect him of having deviated a little from the truth: therefore let Junius aſk no more queſtions. You bite againſt a file: ceaſe viper.

W. D.

LETTER VII.

To Sir WILLIAM DRAPER, KNIGHT of the BATH.

SIR,

AN academical education has given you an unlimited command over the moſt beautiful figures of ſpeech. Maſks, hatchets, racks, and vipers dance thro' your letters in all mazes of metaphorical confuſion. Theſe are the gloomy companions of a diſturbed imagination;—the melancholy madneſs of poetry, without the inſpiration. I will not contend with you in point of compoſition. You are a ſcholar, Sir William, and, if I am truly informed, you write Latin with almoſt as much purity as Engliſh. Suffer me then, for I am a plain unlettered man, to continue that ſtile of interrogation, which ſuits my capa-

city, and to which, conſidering the readineſs of your anſwers, you ought to have no objection. Even Mr. Bingley promiſes to anſwer, if put to the torture.

Do you then really think that, if I were to aſk a *moſt virtuous man* whether he ever committed theft, or murder, it would diſturb his peace of mind? Such a queſtion might perhaps diſcompoſe the gravity of his muſcles, but I believe it would little affect the tranquillity of his conſcience. Examine your own breaſt, Sir William, and you will diſcover, that reproaches and enquiries have no power to afflict either the man of unblemiſhed integrity or the abandoned profligate. It is the middle compound character, which alone is vulnerable:—the man who, without firmneſs enough to avoid a diſhonourable action, has feeling enough to be aſhamed of it.

I thank you for the hint of the decalogue, and ſhall take an opportunity of applying it to ſome of your moſt virtuous friends in both houſes of parliament.

You ſeem to have dropped the affair of your regiment; ſo let it reſt. When you are appointed to another, I dare ſay you will not ſell it either for a groſs ſum, or for any annuity upon lives.

I am truly glad (for really, Sir William, I am not your enemy, nor did I begin this conteſt with you) that you have been able to clear yourſelf of a crime, though at the expence of the higheſt indiſcretion. You ſay that your half-pay was given you by way of penſion. I will not dwell upon the ſingularity of uniting in your own perſon two ſorts of proviſion, which in their own nature, and in all military and parliamentary views are incompatible; but I call upon you to juſtify that declaration, wherein you charge your —— with having done an act in your favour notoriouſly againſt law. The half-pay, both in Ireland and England, is appropriated by parliament; and if it be given to perſons, who, like you, are legally incapable of holding it, it is a breach of law. It would have been more decent in you to have called

this

this diſhonourable tranſaction by its true name;------ a Job to accommodate two perſons, by particular intereſt and management at the caſtle. What ſenſe muſt government have had of your ſervices, when the rewards they have given you are only a diſgrace to you!

And now, Sir William, I ſhall take my leave of you for ever. Motives very different from any apprehenſion of your reſentment, make it impoſſible you ſhould ever know me. In truth, you have ſome reaſon to hold yourſelf indebted to me. From the leſſons I have given, you may collect a profitable inſtruction for your future life. They will either teach you ſo to regulate your conduct, as to be able to ſet the moſt malicious enquiries at defiance; or, if that be a loſt hope, they will teach you prudence enough not to attract the public attention upon a character, which will only paſs without cenſure, when it paſſes without obſervation.

JUNIUS.

JUNIUS'S LETTERS,

TO

The D—— of G———.

LETTER I.

My LORD,

BEFORE you were placed at the head of affairs, it had been a maxim of the Engliſh government, not unwillingly admitted by the people, that every ungracious or ſevere exertion of the prerogative ſhould be placed to the account of the Miniſter; but that whenever an act of grace or benevolence was to be performed the whole merit of it ſhould be attributed to the Sovereign himſelf. It was a wiſe doctrine, my Lord, and equally advantageous to the King and to his ſubjects; for while it preſerved that ſuſpicious attention, with which the people ought always to examine the conduct of miniſters, it tended at the ſame time rather to encreaſe than to diminiſh their attachment to the perſon of their Sovereign. If there be not a fatality attending every meaſure you are concerned in, by what treachery, or by what exceſs of folly has it happened, that thoſe ungracious acts, which have diſtinguiſhed your adminiſtration, and which I doubt not were entirely your own, ſhould carry with them a ſtrong appearance of perſonal intereſt, and even of perſonal enmity in a quarter, where no ſuch intereſt or enmity can be ſuppoſed to exiſt, without the high-

eſt injuſtice and the higheſt diſhonour? On the other hand, by what judicious management, have you contrived it, that the only act of mercy, to which you ever adviſed your ——, far from adding to the luſtre of a character truly gracious and benevolent, ſhould be received with univerſal diſapprobation and diſguſt? I ſhall conſider it as a miniſterial meaſure, becauſe it is an odious one, and as your meaſure, my Lord D—e, becauſe you are the Miniſter:

As long as the trial of this chairman was depending, it was natural enough that government ſhould give him every poſſible encouragement and ſupport. The honourable ſervice, for which he was hired, and the ſpirit with which he performed it, made a common cauſe between your grace and him. The miniſter, who by ſecret corruption invades the freedom of elections, and the ruffian, who by open violence deſtroys the freedom, are embarked in the ſame bottom. They have the ſame intereſts and mutually feel for each other. To do juſtice to your grace's humanity, you felt for Mac Quirk as you ought to do, and if you had been contented to aſſiſt him indirectly, without a notorious denial of juſtice, or openly inſulting the ſenſe of the nation, you might have ſatisfied every duty of political friendſhip, without committing the honour of your —— or hazarding the reputation of his government. But when this unhappy man had been ſolemnly tried, convicted and condemned;— when it appeared that he had been frequently employed in the ſame ſervices, and that no excuſe for him could be drawn either from the innocence of his former life, or the ſimplicity of his character, was it not hazarding too much to interpoſe the ſtrength of the prerogative between this felon and the juſtice of his country? You ought to have known that an example of this ſort was never ſo neceſſary as at preſent, and certainly you muſt have known that the lot could not have fallen upon a more guilty object. What ſyſtem of government is this? You are perpetually complaining of the riotous diſpoſition of the lower

claſs

claſs of the people, yet when the laws have given you the means of making an example, in every ſenſe unexceptionable, and by far the moſt likely to awe the multitude, you pardon offence, and are not aſhamed to give the ſanction of government to the riots you complain of, and even to future murders. You are partial perhaps to the military mode of execution, and had rather ſee a ſcore of theſe wretches butchered by the guards, than one of them ſuffer death by regular courſe of law. How does it happen, my Lord, that, in *your* hands, even the mercy of the prerogative is cruelty and oppreſſion to the ſubject?

The meaſure it ſeems was ſo extraordinary, that you thought it neceſſary to give ſome reaſons for it to the public. Let them be fairly examined.

1. You ſay *that Meſſ. Bromfield and Starling were not examined at Mac Quirk's trial.* I will tell your Grace why they were not. They muſt have been examined upon oath; and it was foreſeen, that their evidence would either not benefit, or might be prejudicial to the priſoner. Otherwiſe, is it conceivable that his counſel ſhould neglect to call in ſuch material evidence?

2. You ſay that *Mr. Foote did not ſee the deceaſed until after his death.* A ſurgeon my Lord, muſt know very little of his profeſſion, if, upon examining a wound, or a contuſion, he cannot determine whether it was mortal or not.—While the party is alive, a ſurgeon will be cautious of pronouncing; whereas by the death of the patient, he is enabled to conſider both cauſe and effect in one view, and to ſpeak with a certainty confirmed by experience.

Yet we are to thank your Grace, for the eſtabliſhment of a new tribunal. Your *inquiſitio poſt mortem* is unknown to the laws of England, and does honour to your invention. The only material objection to it is, that, if Mr. Foote's evidence was inſufficient, becauſe he did not examine the wound, till after the death of the party, much leſs can a negative opinion, given by gentlemen, who never ſaw the body

of

of Mr. Clarke, either before or after his deceaſe, authoriſe you to ſuperſede the verdict of a jury, and the ſentence of the law.

Now, my Lord, let me aſk you, Has it never occurred to your Grace, while you were withdrawing this deſperate wretch from that juſtice, which the laws had awarded, and which the whole people of England demanded againſt him, that there is another man, who is the favourite of his country, whoſe pardon would have been accepted with gratitude, whoſe pardon would have healed all our diviſions? Have you quite forgotten that this man was once your Grace's friend? Or is it to murderers only that you will extend the mercy of the C———n?

Theſe are queſtions you will not anſwer. Nor is it neceſſary. The character of your private life, and the uniform tenour of your public conduct, is an anſwer to them all.

10 *April*, 1769. JUNIUS.

LETTER II.

To his Grace the D— of G———.

My Lord,

I Have ſo good an opinion of your Grace's diſcernment, that when the author of the vindication of your conduct aſſures us, that he writes from his own mere motion, without the leaſt authority from you Grace, I ſhould be ready enough to believe him, but for one fatal mark, which ſeems to be fixed upon every meaſure, in which either your perſonal or your political character is concerned.—Your firſt attempt to ſupport Sir William Proctor ended in the election of Mr. Wilkes; the ſecond enſured ſucceſs to Mr. Glynn. The extraordinary ſtep you took to make Sir James Lowther Lord Paramount of Cumberland, has ruined his intereſt in that county

for ever. The Houſe Liſt of Directors was curſed with the concurrence of government; and even the miſerable D—y could not eſcape the misfortunes of your Grace's protection. With this uniform experience before us, we are authoriſed to ſuſpect, that when a pretended vindication of your principles and conduct in reality contains the bittereſt reflections upon both, it could not have been written without your immediate direction and aſſiſtance. The author, indeed, calls God to witneſs for him, with all the ſincerity, and in the very terms of an Iriſh evidence, *to the beſt of his knowledge and belief.* My Lord, you ſhould not encourage theſe appeals to heaven. The pious Prince, from whom you are ſuppoſed to deſcend, made ſuch frequent uſe of them in his public declarations, that at laſt the people alſo found it neceſſary to appeal to heaven in their turn. Your adminiſtration has driven us into circumſtances of equal diſtreſs;—beware at leaſt how you remind us of the remedy.

You have already much to anſwer for. You have provoked this unhappy gentleman to play the fool once more in public life, in ſpite of his years and infirmities, and to ſhew us, that as you yourſelf are a ſingular inſtance of youth without ſpirit, the man, who defends you, is a no leſs remarkable example of age without the benefit of experience. To follow ſuch a writer minutely would, like his own periods, be a labour without end. The ſubject too has been already diſcuſſed, and is ſufficiently underſtood. I cannot help obſerving, however, that, when the pardon of Mac Quirk was the principal charge againſt you, it would have been but a decent compliment to your Grace's underſtanding, to have defended you upon your own principles. What credit does a man deſerve, who tells us plainly, that the facts ſet forth in the King's proclamation were not the true motives on which the pardon was granted, and that he wiſhes that thoſe chirurgical reports, which firſt gave occaſion to certain doubts in the royal breaſt, had not been laid before his majeſty. You ſee, my Lord, that even your friends

friends cannot defend your actions, without changing your principles, nor juſtify a deliberate meaſure of government, without contradicting the main aſſertion on which it was founded.

The conviction of Mac Quirk had reduced you to a dilemma, in which it was hardly poſſible for you to reconcile your political intereſt with your duty. You were obliged either to abandon an active uſeful partiſan, or to protect a felon from public juſtice. With your uſual ſpirit, you preferred your intereſt to every other conſideration; and with your uſual judgment, you founded your determination upon the only motives, which ſhould not have been given to the public.

I have frequently cenſured Mr. Wilkes's conduct, yet your advocate reproaches me with having devoted myſelf to the ſervice of ſedition. Your Grace can beſt inform us, for which of Mr. Wilkes's good qualities you firſt honoured him with your friendſhip, or how long it was before you diſcovered thoſe bad ones in him, at which, it ſeems, your delicacy was offended. Remember, my Lord, that you continued your connection with Mr. Wilkes long after he had been convicted of thoſe crimes, which you have ſince taken pains to repreſent in the blackeſt colours of blaſphemy and treaſon. How unlucky is it, that the firſt inſtance you have given us of a ſcrupulous regard to decorum is united with the breach of a moral obligation! For my own part, my Lord, I am proud to affirm, that, if I had been weak enough to form ſuch a friendſhip, I would never have been baſe enough to betray it. But, let Mr. Wilkes's character be what it may, this at leaſt is certain, that, circumſtanced as he is with regard to the public, even his vices plead for him. The people of England have too much diſcernment to ſuffer your Grace to take advantage of the failings of a private character, to eſtabliſh a precedent, by which the public liberty is affected, and which you may hereafter, with equal eaſe and ſatisfaction, employ to the ruin of the beſt men in the kingdom.—Content yourſelf my Lord, with the

many advantages, which the unſullied purity of your own character has given you over your unhappy deſerted friend. Avail yourſelf of all the unforgiving piety of the court you live in, and bleſs God that you "are not as other men are; extortioners, unjuſt, "adulterers, or even as this Publican." In a heart void of feeling, the laws of honour and good faith may be violated with impunity, and there you may ſafely indulge your genius. But the laws of England ſhall not be violated, even by your holy zeal to oppreſs a ſinner; and tho' you have ſucceeded in making him the tool, you ſhall not make him the victim of your ambition.

April 10, 1769. JUNIUS.

LETTER III.

SIR,

THE monody on the ſuppoſed death of Junius is not the leſs poetical for being founded on a fiction. In ſome parts of it, there is a promiſe of genius, which deſerves to be encouraged. My letter of Monday will, I hope, convince the author that I am neither a partiſan of Mr. Wilkes, nor yet bought off by the miniſtry. It is true I have refuſed offers, which a more prudent or a more intereſted man would have accepted. Whether it be ſimplicity or virtue in me, I can only affirm that *I am in earneſt*; becauſe I am convinced, as far as my underſtanding is capable of judging, that the preſent miniſtry are driving this country to deſtruction; and you, I think, Sir, may be ſatisfied that my rank and fortune place me above a common bribe.

JUNIUS.

To

LETTER IV.

To Mr. EDWARD WESTON.

SIR,

I SAID you were an old man without the benefit of experience. It ſeems you are alſo a volunteer with the ſtipend of twenty commiſſions; and at a period when all proſpects are at an end, you are ſtill looking forward to rewards, which you cannot enjoy. No man is better acquainted with the bounty of government than you are,

——*ton impudence,*
Temeraire vieillard, aura ſa recompenſe.

But I will not deſcend to an altercation either with the impotence of your age, or the peeviſhneſs of your diſeaſes. Your pamphlet, ingenious as it is, has been ſo little read, that the public cannot know how far you have a right to give me the lye, without the following citation of your own words.

Page 6—'1. That he is perſuaded that the motives, 'which he (Mr. Weſton) has alledged, muſt appear 'fully ſufficient, with or without the opinions of the 'ſurgeons.

'2. That thoſe very motives MUST HAVE BEEN 'the foundation, on which the earl of Rochford "thought proper, &c.

'3. That he CANNOT BUT REGRET that the Earl 'of Rochford ſeems to have thought proper to lay the 'chirurgical reports before the King, in preference 'to all the other ſufficient motives,' &c.

Let the public determine whether this be defending government on their principles or your own.

The ſtile and language you have adopted are, I confeſs, not ill ſuited to the elegance of your own manners, or to the dignity of the cauſe you have undertaken. Every common dauber writes raſcal and villain under his pictures, becauſe the pictures themſelves have neither character not reſemblance. But the

the works of a maſter require no index. His features and colouring are taken from nature. The impreſſion they make is immediate and uniform; nor is it poſſible to miſtake his characters, whether they repreſent the treachery of a miniſter, or the abuſed ſimplicity of a -----.

April 21, 1769. JUNIUS.

LETTER V.

To his Grace the D---- of G******.

My Lord,

THE ſyſtem you ſeemed to have adopted, when Lord C------m unexpectedly left you at the head of affairs, gave us no promiſe of that uncommon exertion of vigour which has ſince illuſtrated your character and diſtinguiſhed your adminiſtration. Far from diſcovering a ſpirit bold enough to invade the firſt rights of the people, and the firſt principles of the conſtitution, you were ſcrupulous of exerciſing even thoſe powers, with which the executive branch of the legiſlature is legally inveſted. We have not yet forgotten how long Mr. Wilkes was ſuffered to appear at large, nor how long he was at liberty to canvas for the city and county, with all the terrors of an outlawry hanging over him. Our gracious ſovereign has not yet forgotten the extraordinary care you took of his dignity and of the ſafety of his perſon, when, at a criſis which courtiers affected to call alarming, you left the metropolis expoſed for two nights together, to every ſpecies of riot and diſorder. The ſecurity of the royal reſidence from inſult was then ſufficiently provided for in Mr. C---w--y's firmneſs and Lord W-----th's diſcretion; while the prime miniſter of Great Britain, in a rural retirement and in the arms of a faded beauty,

had

had loſt all memory of his Sovereign, his country and himſelf. In theſe inſtances you might have acted with vigour, for you would have had the ſanction of the laws to ſupport you. The friends of government might have defended you without ſhame, and moderate men, who wiſh well to the peace and good order of ſociety, might have had a pretence for applauding your conduct. But theſe it ſeems were not occaſions worthy of your grace's interpoſition. You reſerved the proofs of your intrepid ſpirit for trials of greater hazard and importance; and now, as if the moſt diſgraceful relaxation of the executive authority had given you a claim of credit to indulge in exceſſes ſtill more dangerous, you ſeem determined to compenſate amply for your former negligence; and to balance the non-execution of the laws with a breach of the conſtitution. From one extreme you ſuddenly ſtart to the other, without leaving, between the weakneſs and the fury of the paſſions, one moment's interval for the firmneſs of the underſtanding.

Theſe obſervations, general as they are, might eaſily be extended into a faithful hiſtory of your grace's adminiſtration, and perhaps may be the employment of a future hour. But the buſineſs of the preſent moment will not ſuffer me to look back to a ſeries of events, which ceaſe to be intereſting or important, becauſe they are ſucceeded by a meaſure ſo ſingularly daring, that it excites all our attention and engroſſes all our reſentment.

Your patronage of Mr. Luttrell has been crowned with ſucceſs. With this precedent before you, with the principles of which it was eſtabliſhed, and with a future houſe of commons perhaps leſs virtuous than the preſent, every county in England, under the auſpices of the treaſury, may be repreſented as completely as the county of Middleſex. Poſterity will be indebted to your grace for not contenting yourſelf with a temporary expedient, but entailing upon them the immediate bleſſings of your adminiſtration. Boroughs were already too much at the mercy of government.

vernment. Counties could neither be purchaſed nor intimidated. But their ſolemn determined election may be rejected, and the man they deteſt may be appointed, by another choice, to repreſent them in parliament. Yet it is admitted that the ſheriffs obeyed the laws and performed their duty. The return they made muſt have been legal and valid, or undoubtedly they would have been cenſured for making it. With every good-natured allowance for your grace's youth and inexperience, there are ſome things which you cannot but know. You cannot but know that the right of the freeholders to adhere to their choice (even ſuppoſing it improperly exerted) was as clear and indiſputable as that of the houſe of commons to exclude one of their own members?—nor is it poſſible for you not to ſee the wide diſtance there is between the negative power of rejecting one man, and the poſitive power of appointing another. The right of expulſion, in the moſt favourable ſenſe, is no more than the cuſtom of parliament. The right of election is the very eſſence of the conſtitution. To violate that right, and much more to transfer it to any other ſet of men, is a ſtep leading immediately to the diſſolution of all government. So far forth as it operates, it conſtitutes a houſe of commons, which does not repreſent the people. A houſe of commons ſo formed would involve a contradiction and the groſſeſt confuſion of ideas; but there are ſome miniſters, my Lord, whoſe views can only be anſwered by reconciling abſurdites, and making the ſame propoſition, which is falſe and abſurd in argument, true in fact.

This meaſure, my Lord, is however attended with one conſequence, favourable to the people, which I am perſuaded you did not foreſee. While the conteſt lay between the miniſtry and Mr. Wilkes, his ſituation and private character gave you advantages over him which common candour, if not the memory of your former friendſhip, ſhould have forbidden you to make uſe of. To religious men you had an opportunity of exaggerating the irregularities of his paſt life;—

life;—to moderate men you held forth the pernicious conſequences of faction. Men, who with this character, looked no farther than to the object before them, were not diſſatisfied at ſeeing Mr. Wilkes excluded from Parliament. You have now taken care to ſhift the queſtion; or, rather, you have created a new one, in which Mr. Wilkes is no more concerned than any other Engliſh gentleman. You have united this country againſt you on one grand conſtitutional point, on the deciſion of which our exiſtence, as a free people, abſolutely depends. You have aſſerted, not in words but in fact, that repreſentation in parliament does not depend upon the choice of the freeholders. If ſuch a caſe can poſſibly happen once, it may happen frequently; it may happen always;—and if three hundred votes, by any mode of reaſoning whatſoever, can prevail againſt twelve hundred, the ſame reaſoning would equally have given Mr. Luttrell his ſeat with ten votes, or even with one. The conſequences of this attack upon the conſtitution are too plain and palpable not to alarm the dulleſt apprehenſion, I truſt you will find, that the people of England are neither deficient in ſpirit nor underſtanding, though you have treated them, as if they had neither ſenſe to feel, nor ſpirit to reſent. We have reaſon to thank God and our anceſtors, that there never yet was a miniſter in this country, who could ſtand the iſſue of ſuch a conflict; and with every prejudice in favour of your attentions, I ſee no ſuch abilities in your Grace, as ſhould entitle you to ſucceed in an enterprize, in which the ableſt and baſeſt of your predeceſſors have found their deſtruction. You may continue to deceive your gracious maſter with falſe repreſentations of the temper and condition of his ſubjects. You may command a venal vote, becauſe it is the common eſtabliſhed appendage of your office. But never hope that the freeholders will make a tame ſurrender of their rights, or that an Engliſh army will join with you in overturning the liberties of their country. They know that their firſt

duty, as citizens, is paramount to all ſubſequent engagements, nor will they prefer the diſcipline or even the honours of their profeſſion to thoſe ſacred original rights, which belonged to them before they were ſoldiers, and which they claim and poſſeſs as the birth-rights of Engliſhmen.

Return, my Lord, before it be too late, to that eaſy inſipid ſyſtem, which you firſt ſet out with. Take back your miſtreſs;---the name of friend may be fatal to her, for it leads to treachery and proſecution. Indulge the people. Attend Newmarket. Mr. Luttrell may again vacate his ſeat; and Mr. Wilkes, if not perſecuted, will ſoon be forgotten. To be weak and inactive is ſafer than to be daring and criminal; and wide is the diſtance between a riot of the populace and a convulſion of the whole kingdom. You may live to make the experiment, but no honeſt man can wiſh you ſhould ſurvive it.

April 24, 1769. JUNIUS.

LETTER VI.

To his Grace the D—— of G——.

My Lord,

IF the meaſures in which you have been moſt ſucceſsful, had been ſupported by any tolerable appearance of argument, I ſhould have thought my time not ill employed, in continuing to examine your conduct as a miniſter, and ſtating it fairly to the public: but when I ſee queſtions of the higheſt national importance carried as they have been, and the firſt principles of the conſtitution openly violated, without argument or decency, I confeſs, I give up the cauſe in deſpair. The meaneſt of your predeceſſors had abilities ſufficient to give a colour to their meaſures. If they invaded the rights of the people,

people, they did not dare to offer a direct inſult to their underſtanding; and, in former times, the moſt venal parliaments made it a condition, in their bargain with the miniſter, that he ſhould furniſh them with ſome plauſible pretences for ſelling their country and themſelves. You have had the merit of introducing a more compendious ſyſtem of government and logic. You neither addreſs yourſelf to the paſſions nor to the underſtanding, but ſimply to the touch. You apply yourſelf immediately to the feelings of your friends, who, contrary to the forms of parliament, never enter heartily into a debate, until they have divided.

Relinquiſhing, therefore, all idle views of amendment to your Grace, or of benefit to the public, let me be permitted to conſider your character and conduct merely as a ſubject of curious ſpeculation.—There is ſomething in both, which diſtinguiſhes you not only from all other miniſters, but all other men. It is not that you do wrong by deſign, but that you ſhould never do right by miſtake. It is not that your indolence and your activity have been equally miſapplied, but that the firſt uniform principle, or, if I may ſo call it, the genius of your life, ſhould have carried you through every poſſible change and contradiction of conduct, without the momentary imputation or colour of a virtue; and that the wildeſt ſpirit of inconſiſtency ſhould never once have betrayed you into a wiſe or honourable action. This, I own, gives an air of ſingularity to your fortune, as well as to your diſpoſition. Let us look back together to a ſcene, in which a mind like your's will find nothing to repent of. Let us try, my Lord, how well you have ſupported the various relations in which you ſtood, to your ſovereign, your country, your friends, and yourſelf. Give us, if it be poſſible, ſome excuſe to poſterity, and to ourſelves, for ſubmitting to your adminiſtration. If not the abilities of a great miniſter, if not the integrity of a patriot, or the fidelity of a friend, ſhew us, at leaſt,

the firmneſs of a man.---For the ſake of your miſtreſs, the lover ſhall be ſpared, I will not lead her into public, as you have done, nor will I inſult the memory of departed beauty. Her ſex, which alone made her amiable in your eyes, makes her reſpectable in mine.

The character of the reputed anceſtors of ſome men has made it poſſible for their deſcendants to be vicious in the extreme, without being degenerate. Thoſe of your Grace, for inſtance, left no diſtreſſing examples of virtue, even to their legitimate poſterity, and you may look back with pleaſure to an illuſtrious pedigree, in which heraldry has not left a ſingle good quality upon record to inſult or upbraid you. You have better proofs of your decent, my Lord, than the regiſter of a marriage, or any troubleſome inheritance of reputation. There are ſome hereditary ſtrokes of character, by which a family may be as clearly diſtinguiſhed as by the blackeſt features in the human face. Charles the Firſt lived and died a hypocrite. Charles the Second was a hypocrrite of another ſort, and ſhould have died upon the ſame ſcaffold. At the diſtance of a century, we ſee their different characters happily revived and blended in your Grace. Sullen and ſevere without religion, profligate without gaiety, you live like Charles the ſecond, without being an amiable companion, and, for ought I know, may die as his father did, without the reputation of a martyr.

You had already taken your degrees with credit in thoſe ſchools, in which the Engliſh nobility are formed to virtue, when you were introduced to Lord Chatham's protection. From Newmarket, White's, and the Oppoſition, he gave you to the world with an air of popularity, which young men uſually ſet out with, and ſeldom preſerve;—grave and plauſible enough to be thought fit for buſineſs, too young for treachery, and in ſhort, a patriot of no unpromiſing expectations. Lord Chatham was the earlieſt object of your political wonder and attachment; yet you deſerted

deſerted him, upon the firſt hopes that offered of an equal ſhare of power with Lord Rockingham.—— When the Duke of Cumberland's firſt negotiation failed, and when the Favourite was puſhed to the laſt extremity, you ſaved him, by joining with an adminiſtration, in which Lord Chatham had refuſed to engage. Still, however, he was your friend, and you are yet to explain to the world, why you conſented to act without him, or why, after uniting with Lord Rockingham, you deſerted and betrayed him. You complained that no meaſures were taken to ſatisfy your patron, and that your friend, Mr. Wilkes, who had ſuffered ſo much for the party, had been abandoned to his fate. They have ſince contributed, not a little, to your preſent plenitude of power; yet, I think, Lord Chatham has leſs reaſon than ever to be ſatisfied: and as for Mr. Wilkes, it is, perhaps, the greateſt misfortune of his life, that you ſhould have ſo many compenſations to make in the cloſet for your former friendſhip with him. Your gracious maſter underſtands your character, and makes you a perſecutor, becauſe you have been a friend.

Lord Chatham formed his laſt adminiſtration upon principles which you certainly concurred in, or you could never have been placed at the head of the treaſury. By deſerting thoſe principles, and by acting in direct contradiction to them, in which, he found you were ſecretly ſupported in the cloſet, you ſoon forced him to leave you to yourſelf, and to withdraw his name from an adminiſtration, which had been formed on the credit of it. You had then a proſpect of friendſhips better ſuited to your genius, and more likely to fix your diſpoſition. Marriage is the point on which every rake is ſtationary at laſt; and truly my Lord, you may well be weary of the circuit you have taken, for you have now fairly travelled thro' every ſign in the political Zodiac, from the Scorpion, in which you ſtung Lord Chatham, to the hopes of a Virgin in the houſe of Bl---ſ---y. One would think

think that you had had ſufficient experience of the frailty of nuptial engagements, or, at leaſt, that ſuch a friendſhip as the Duke of B———d's might have been ſecured to you by the auſpicious marriage of your late D-----s with his nephew. But ties of this tender nature cannot be drawn too cloſe; and it may poſſibly be a part of the D--- of B---f---d's ambition after making *her* an honeſt woman, to work a miracle of the ſame ſort upon your G-----. This worthy Nobleman has long dealt in virtue. There has been a large conſumption of it in his own family; and, in the way of traffick, I dare ſay, he has bought and ſold more than half the repreſentative integrity of the nation.

In a political view, this union is not imprudent. The favour of princes is a periſhable commodity. You have now a ſtrength ſufficient to command the cloſet; and if it be neceſſary to betray one feiendſhip more, you may ſet even Lord Bute at defiance. Mr. Stuart Mackenzie may poſſibly remember what uſe the D---- of B---df---d uſually makes of his power, and our gracious Sovereign, I doubt not, rejoices at this firſt appearance of union among his ſervants. His late Majeſty, under the happy influence of a family connection between his miniſters, was relieved from the cares of government. A more active prince may perhaps obſerve with ſuſpicion, by what degrees an artful ſervant grows upon his maſter from the firſt unlimitted profeſſions of duty and attachment to the painful repreſentation of neceſſity of the royal ſervice, and ſoon, in regular progreſſion, to the humble inſolence of dictating in all the obſequious forms of peremptory ſubmiſſion. The interval is carefully employed in forming connections, creating intereſts, collecting a party, and laying the foundation of double marriages, until the deluded prince, who thought he had found a creature proſtituted to his ſervice, and inſignificant enough to be always dependant upon his pleaſure, finds him at laſt too ſtrong

to

to be commanded, and too formidable to be removed.

Your grace's public conduct, as a miniſter, is but the counter-part of your private hiſtory, the ſame inconſiſtency, the ſame contradictions. In America we trace you, from the firſt oppoſition to the Stamp Act, on principles of convenience, to Mr. Pitt's ſurrender of the right; then forward to Lord Rockingham's ſurrender of the fact; then back again to Lord Rockingham's declaration of the right; then forward to taxation with Mr. Townſhend; and in the laſt inſtance, from the gentle Conway's undetermined diſcretion, to blood and compulſion with the D---- of B---d---d: Yet if we may believe the ſimplicity of Lord North's eloquence, at the opening of next ſeſſions you are once more to be patron of America. Is this the wiſdom of a great Miniſter? or is it the vibration of a Pendulum? Had you no opinion of your own, my Lord? or was it the gratification of betraying every party with which you had been united, and of deſerting every political principle in which you had concurred.

Your enemies may turn their eyes without regret from this admirable ſyſtem of provincial government: They will find gratification enough in the ſurvey of your domeſtic and foreign policy.

If, inſtead of diſowning with Lord Shelburne, the Britiſh court had interpoſed with dignity and firmneſs, you know, my Lord, that Corſica would never have been invaded. The French ſaw the weakneſs of a diſtracted miniſtry, and were juſtified in treating you with contempt: They would probably have yielded in the firſt inſtance rather than hazard a rupture with this country; but being once engaged, they cannot retreat without diſhonour. Common ſenſe foreſees conſequences which have eſcaped your Grace's penetration. Either we ſuffer the French to make an acquiſition, the importance of which you have probably no conception of, or we oppoſe them by an underhand management, which only diſgraces us in the

the eyes of Europe, without anſwering any purpoſe of policy or prudence. From ſecret, indiſcrete aſſiſtance, a tranſition to ſome more open deciſive meaſures becomes unavoidable, till at laſt we find ourſelves principals in the war, and are obliged to hazard every thing for an object which might originally be obtained without expence or danger. I am not verſed in the politicks of the north; but this I believe is certain, that half the money you have diſtributed to carry the expulſion of Mr. Wilkes, or even your Secretary's ſhare in the laſt ſubſcription, would have kept the Turks at your devotion. Was it œconomy my Lord? or did the coy reſiſtance you have conſtantly met with in the Britiſh Senate make you deſpair of corrupting the Divan? Your friends indeed have the firſt claim upon your bounty, but if five hundred pounds a year can be ſpared in penſion to Sir John Moore, it would not have diſgraced you to have allowed ſomething to the ſecret ſervice of the public.

You will ſay perhaps that the ſituation of affairs at home demanded and engroſſed the whole of your attention. Here, I confeſs, you have been active. An amiable accompliſhed prince aſcends to the throne under the happieſt of all auſpices, the acclamations and united affections of his ſubjects. The firſt meaſures of his reign, and even the odium of a favourite were not able to ſhake their attachments. *Your* ſervices, my Lord, have been more ſucceſsful. Since you were permitted to take the lead, we have ſeen the natural effects of a ſyſtem of government at once both odious and contemptible. We have ſeen the laws ſometimes ſcandalouſly relaxed, ſometimes violently ſtretched beyond their tone. We have ſeen the ſacred perſon of the Sovereign inſulted; and in profound peace, and with an undiſputed title, the fidelity of his ſubjects brought by his own Servants into public queſtion. Without abilities, reſolution, or intereſt, you have done more than Lord Bute could accompliſh with all Scotland at his heels.

Your

Your Grace, little anxious perhaps either for preſent or future reputation, will not deſire to be handed down in theſe colours to poſterity. You have reaſon to flatter yourſelf that the memory of your adminiſtration will ſurvive even the forms of a conſtitution, which our anceſtors vainly hoped would be immortal; and as for your perſonal character, I will not, for the honour of human nature, ſuppoſe that you can wiſh to have it remembered. The condition of the preſent times is deſperate indeed; but there is a debt due to thoſe who come after us, and it is the Hiſtorian's office to puniſh, tho' he cannot correct. I do not give you to poſterity as a pattern to imitate, but as an example to deter; and as your conduct comprehends every thing that a wiſe or honeſt miniſter ſhould avoid, I mean to make you a negative inſtruction to your ſucceſſors for ever.

JUNIUS.

LETTER VII.

To his Grace the D— of G——.

My LORD,

IF nature had given you an underſtanding qualified to keep peace with the wiſhes and principles of your heart, ſhe would have made you, perhaps the moſt formidable miniſter that ever was employed, under a limited monarch, to accompliſh the ruin of a free people. When neither the feelings of ſhame, the reproaches of conſcience, nor the dread of puniſhment, form any bar to the deſigns of a miniſter, the people would have too much reaſon to lament their condition, if they did not find ſome reſource in the weakneſs of his underſtanding. We owe it to the bounty of providence, that the compleateſt depravity of the heart is

ſometimes ſtrangely united with a confuſion of the mind, which counteracts the moſt favourite principles, and makes the ſame man treacherous without art, and a hypocrite without deceiving. The meaſures, for inſtance, in which your Grace's activity has been chiefly exerted, as they were adopted without ſkill, ſhould have been conducted with more than common dexterity. But, truly, my Lord, the execution has been as groſs as the deſign. By one deciſive ſtep, you have defeated all the arts of writing. You have fairly confounded the intrigues of oppoſition, and ſilenced the clamours of faction. A dark ambiguous ſyſtem might require and furniſh the materials of ingenious illuſtration, and, in doubtful meaſures, the virulent exaggeration of party muſt be employed, to rouze and engage the paſſions of the people. You have now brought the merits of your adminiſtration to an iſſue, on which every Engliſhman, of the narroweſt capacity, may determine for himſelf. It is not an alarm to the paſſions, but a calm appeal to the judgement of the people upon their own moſt eſſential intereſts. A more experienced miniſter would not have hazarded a direct inv—n of the firſt principles of the conſtitution, before he had made ſome progreſs in ſubduing the ſpirit of the people. With ſuch a cauſe as your's my Lord, it is not ſufficient that you have the court at your devotion, unleſs you can find means to corrupt or intimidate the jury. The collective body of the people form that jury, and from their deciſion there is but one appeal.

Whether you have talents to ſupport you, at a criſis of ſuch difficulty and danger, ſhould long ſince have been conſidered. Judging truly of your diſpoſition, you have perhaps miſtaken the extent of your capacity. Good faith and folly have ſo long been received as ſynonimous terms, that the reverſe of the propoſition has grown into credit, and every villain fancies himſelf a man of abilities. It is the apprehenſion of your friends, my Lord, that you have drawn

drawn ſome haſty concluſion of this ſort, and that a partial reliance upon your moral character has betrayed you beyond the depth of your underſtanding. You have now carried things too far to retreat. You have plainly declared to the people what they are to expect from the continuance of your adminiſtration. It is time for your Grace to conſider what you alſo may expect in return from *their* ſpirit and *their* reſentment.

Since the acceſſion of our moſt gracious ſovereign to the throne, we have ſeen a ſyſtem of government, which may well be called a reign of experiments. Parties of all denominations have been employed and diſmiſſed. The advice of the ableſt men in this country has been repeatedly called for and rejected; and when the royal diſpleaſure has been ſignified to a miniſter, the marks of it have uſually been proportioned to his abilities and integrity. The ſpirit of the FAVOURITE had ſome apparent influence upon every adminiſtration; and every ſet of miniſters preſerved an appearance of duration, as long as they ſubmitted to that influence. But there were certain ſervices to be performed for the Favourite's ſecurity, or to gratify his reſentments, which your predeceſſors in office had the wiſdom or the virtue not to undertake. The moment this refractory ſpirit was diſcovered, their diſgrace was determined. Lord Chatham, Mr. Grenville, and Lord Rockingham, have ſucceſſively had the honour to be diſmiſſed, for prefering their duty, as ſervants of the public, to thoſe compliances which were expected from their ſtation. A ſubmiſſive adminiſtration was at laſt gradually collected from the deſerters of all parties, intereſts and connexions: and nothing remained but to find a leader for theſe gallant well diſciplined troops. Stand forth, my Lord, for thou art the man. Lord Bute found no reſource of dependence or ſecurity in the proud impoſing ſuperiority of Lord Chatham's abilities, the ſhrewd inflexible judgment of Mr. Grenville, nor in the mild but determined integrity of

Lord Rockingham. His views and ſituation required a creature void of all theſe properties; and he was forced to go through every diviſion, reſolution, compoſition and refinement of political chemiſtry, before he happily arrived at the caput mortuum of vitriol in your Grace. Flat and inſipid in your retired ſtate, but brought into action you become vitriol again. Such are the extremes of alternate indolence or fury, which have governed your whole adminiſtration. Your circumſtances with regard to the people ſoon becoming deſperate, like other honeſt ſervants, you determined to involve the beſt of maſters in the ſame difficulties with yourſelf. We owe it to your Grace's well-directed labours, that your Sovereign has been perſuaded to doubt of the affections of his ſubjects, and the people to ſuſpect the virtues of their Sovereign, at a time when both were unqueſtionable. You have degraded the royal dignity into a baſe, diſhonourable competition with Mr. Wilkes, nor had you abilities to carry even this laſt contemptible triumph over a private man, without the groſſeſt v--l--t -n of the fundamental laws of the conſtitution and rights of the people. But theſe are rights my Lord, which you can no more annihilate than you can the ſoil to which they are annexed. The queſtion no longer turns upon points of national honour and ſecurity abroad, or on the degrees of expedience and propriety of meaſures at home. It was not inconſiſtent that you ſhould abandon the cauſe of liberty in another country, which you had perſecuted in your own; and in the common arts of domeſtic corruption, we miſs no part of Sir Robert Walpole's ſyſtem except his abilities. In this humble imitative line you might long have proceeded, ſafe and contemptible. You might probably never have riſen to the dignity of being hated, and you might even have been deſpiſed with moderation. But it ſeems you meant to be diſtinguiſhed, and to a mind like yours there was no other road to fame but by the d-ſt--ct-n of a noble fabric, which you thought had been too

long

long the admiration of mankind. The uſe you have made of the military force introduced an alarming change in the mode of executing the laws. This arbitrary appointment of Mr. Luttrell i—v—des the foundation of the laws themſelves, as it manifeſtly transfers the right of legiſlation from thoſe whom the people have choſen, to thoſe whom they have rejected. With a ſucceſſion of ſuch appointments, we may ſoon ſee a houſe of commons collected, in the choice of which the other towns and counties of England will have as little ſhare as the devoted county of Middleſex.

Yet I truſt your Grace will find that the people of this country are neither to be intimidated by violent meaſures, nor deceived by refinements. When they ſee Mr. Luttrell ſeated in the houſe of commons by mere dint of power, and in direct oppoſition to the choice of a whole county, they will not liſten to thoſe ſubtleties by which every arbitrary exertion of authority is explained into the law and privilege of parliament. It requires no perſuaſion of argument, but ſimply the evidence of the ſenſes, to convince them, that to transfer the right of election from the collective to the repreſentative body of the people, contradicts all thoſe ideas of a houſe of commons, which they have received from their forefathers, and which they had already, though vainly perhaps, delivered to their children. The principles, on which this violent meaſure has been defended, have added ſcorn to injury, and forced us to feel, that we are not only oppreſſed but inſulted.

With what force, my Lord, with what protection, are you prepared to meet the united deteſtation of the people of England? The city of London has given a generous example to the kingdom, in what manner a king of his country ought to be addreſſed; and I fancy, my Lord, it is not yet in your courage to ſtand between your ſovereign and the addreſſes of his ſubjects. The injuries you have done this country are

ſuch

ſuch as demand not only redreſs, but vengeance. In vain ſhall you look for protection to that v-n-l vote, which you have already paid for: another muſt be purchaſed; and, to ſave a miniſter, the h—— of c—— muſt declare themſelves not only independent of their conſtituents, but the determined enemies of the conſtitution. Conſider, my Lord, whether this be an extremity, to which their fears will permit them to advance; or, if their protection ſhould fail you, how far you are authoriſed to rely upon the ſincerity of thoſe ſmiles, which a pious c——t laviſhes without reluctance upon a libertine by profeſſion. It is not indeed the leaſt of the thouſand contradictions which attend you, that a man, marked to the world by the groſſeſt violation of all ceremony and decorum, ſhould be the firſt ſervant of a c——t, in which prayers are morality, and kneeling is religion. Truſt not too far to appearances, by which your predeceſſors have been deceived, though they have not been injured. Even the beſt of princes may at laſt diſcover that this is a contention in which every thing may be loſt, but nothing can be gained; and as you became miniſter by accident, were adopted without choice, truſted without confidence, and continued without favour, be aſſured that, whenever an occaſion preſſes, you will be diſregarded without even the forms of regret. You will then have reaſon to be thankful, if you are permitted to retire to that ſeat of learning, which, in contemplation of the ſyſtem of your life, the comparative purity of your manners with thoſe of their high ſteward, and a thouſand other recommending circumſtances, has choſen you to encourage the growing virtue of their youth, and to preſide over their education. Whenever the ſpirit of diſtributing prebends and biſhopricks ſhall have departed from you, you will find that learned ſeminary perfectly recovered from the delirium of an inſtallation, and, what in truth it ought to be, once more a peaceful ſcene of ſlumber and meditation. The venerable tutors of the

univerſity

univerſity will no longer diſtreſs your modeſty, by propoſing you for a pattern to their pupils. The learned dulneſs of declamation will be ſilent; and even the venal Muſe, though happieſt in fiction, will forget your virtues. Yet, for the benefit of the ſucceeding age, I could wiſh that your retreat might be deferred until your morals ſhall happily be ripened to that maturity of corruption, at which philoſophers tell us, the worſt examples ceaſe to be contagious.

July 8, 1769. JUNIUS.

LETTER VIII.

SIR,

A GREAT deal of uſeleſs argument might have been ſaved, in the political conteſt, which has ariſen from the expulſion of Mr. Wilkes, and the ſubſequent appointment of Mr. Luttrell, if the queſtion had been once ſtated with preciſion, to the ſatisfaction of each party, and clearly underſtood by them both. But in this, as in almoſt every other diſpute, it uſually happens that much time is loſt in referring to a multitude of caſes and precedents, which prove nothing to the purpoſe, or in maintaining propoſitions, which are either not diſputed, or, whether they be admitted or denied, are entirely indifferent as to the matter in debate; until at laſt the mind, perplexed and confounded with the endleſs ſubtleties of controverſy, loſes ſight of the main queſtion, and never arrives at truth. Both parties in the diſpute are apt enough to practiſe theſe diſhoneſt artifices. The man who is conſcious of the weakneſs of his cauſe, is intereſted in concealing it; and on the other ſide it is not uncommon to ſee a good cauſe mangled by advocates who do not know the real ſtrength of it.

I ſhoul

I ſhould be glad to know, for inſtance, to what purpoſe in the preſent caſe ſo many precedents have been produced to prove, that the houſe of commons have a right to expel one of their own members; that it belongs to them to judge of the validity of elections; or that the law of parliament is part of the law of the land? After all theſe propoſitions are admitted, Mr. Luttrell's right to his ſeat will continue to be juſt as diſputable as it was before. Not one of them is at preſent in agitation. Let it be admitted that the houſe of commons were authoriſed to expel Mr. Wilkes; that they are the proper court to judge of Elections; and that the law of parliament is binding upon the people; ſtill it remains to be enquired whether the houſe, by their reſolution in favour of Mr. Luttrell, have or have not truly declared that law. To facilitate this enquiry I would have the queſtion cleared of all foreign or indifferent matter. The following ſtate of it will probably be thought a fair one by both parties; and then I imagine there is no gentleman in this country who will not be capable of forming a judicious and true opinion upon it. I take the queſtion to be ſtrictly this: Whether or no it be the known eſtabliſhed law of parliament, that the expulſion of a member of the houſe of commons of itſelf creates in him ſuch an incapacity to be re-elected, that, at a ſubſequent election, any votes given to him are null and void, and that any other candidate, who, except the perſon expelled, has the greateſt number of votes, ought to be the ſitting member?

To prove that the affirmative is the law of Parliament, I apprehend it is not ſufficient for the preſent houſe of commons to declare it to be ſo. We may ſhut our eyes indeed to the dangerous conſequences of ſuffering one branch of the legiſlature to declare new laws, without argument or example, and it may perhaps be prudent enough to ſubmit to authority; but a mere aſſertion will never convince, much leſs will it be thought reaſonable to prove the right by the

fact

fact itſelf. The miniſtry have not yet pretended to ſuch a tyranny over our minds. To ſupport the affirmative fairly, it will either be neceſſary to produce ſome ſtatute in which that poſitive proviſion ſhall have been made, that ſpecific diſability clearly created, and the conſequences of it declared; or if there be no ſuch ſtatute, the cuſtom of parliament muſt then be referred to, and ſome caſe or caſes, ſtrictly in point, muſt be produced, with the deciſion of the court upon them; for I readily admit that the cuſtom of parliament, once clearly proved, is equally binding with the common and ſtatute law.

The conſideration of what may be reaſonable or unreaſonable makes no part of this queſtion. We are enquiring what the law is, not what it ought to be. Reaſon may be applied to ſhew the impropriety or expedience of a law, but we muſt have either ſtatute or precedent to prove the exiſtence of it. At the ſame time I do not mean to admit that the late reſolution of the houſe of commons is defenſible on general principles of reaſon, any more than in law. This is not the hinge on which the debate turns.

Suppoſing thefore that I have laid down an accurate ſtate of the queſtion, I will venture to affirm, 1ſt. That there is no ſtatute exiſting by which that ſpecific diſability which we ſpeak of is created. If thers be, let it be produced. The argument will then be at an end.

2dly. That there is no precedent in all the proceedings of the houſe of commons, which comes entirely home to the preſent caſe, viz. 'where an expelled member has been returned again, and another candidate, with an inferior number of votes, has been declared the ſitting member.' If there be ſuch a precedent, let it be given to us plainly, and I am ſure it will have more weight than all the cunning arguments which have been drawn from inferences and probabilities.

The miniſtry, in that laborious pamphlet which I preſume contains the whole ſtrength of the party, have

declared " that Mr. Walpole's was the firſt and only " inſtance, in which the electors of any county or " borough had returned a perſon expelled to ſerve in " the ſame parliament " It is not poſſible to conceive a caſe more exactly in point. Mr. Walpole was expelled, and having a majority of votes at the next election, was returned again. The friends of Mr. Taylor, a candidate ſet up by the miniſtry, petitioned the houſe that he might be the ſitting member. Thus far the circumſtances tally exactly, except that our houſe of commons ſaved Mr. Luttrell the trouble of petitioning. The point of law however was the ſame. It came regularly before the Houſe, and it was their buſineſs to determine upon it. They did determine it, for they declared Mr. Taylor *not duly elected*. If it be ſaid that they meant this reſolution as matter of favour and indulgence to the borough, which had retorted Mr. Walpole upon them, in order that the Burgeſſes knowing what the law was, might correct their error, I anſwer,

I. That it is a ſtrange way of arguing to oppoſe a ſuppoſition, which no man can prove, to a fact which proves itſelf.

II. That if this were the intention of the houſe of commons, it muſt have defeated itſelf. The Burgeſſes of Lynn could never have known their error, much leſs could they have corrected it by any inſtruction they received from the proceedings of the houſe of commons They might perhaps have foreſeen this if they returned Mr. Walpole again, he would again be rejected; but they never could infer, from a reſolution by which the candidate with the feweſt votes was declared *not duly elected*, that, at a future election, and in ſimilar circumſtances, the houſe of commons would reverſe their reſolution, and receive the ſame candidate as duly elected, whom they had before rejected.

This indeed would have been a moſt extraordinary way of declaring the law of parliament, and what I

preſume

preſume no man, whoſe underſtanding is not at croſs-purpoſes with itſelf, could poſſibly underſtand.

If in a caſe of this importance, I thought myſelf at liberty to argue from ſuppoſitions rather than from facts; I think the probability in this caſe is directly the reverſe of what the miniſtry affirm; and that it is much more likely that the houſe of commons at that time would rather have ſtrained a point in favour of Mr. Taylor, than that they would have violated the law of parliament, and robbed Mr. Taylor of a right legally veſted in him, to gratify a refractory borough, which in defiance of them, had returned a perſon branded with the ſtrongeſt mark of the diſpleaſure of the houſe.

But really, Sir, this way of talking, for I cannot call it argument, is a mockery of the common underſtanding of the nation, too groſs to be endured. Our deareſt intereſts are at ſtake. An attempt has been made, not merely to rob a ſingle county of its rights, but, by inevitable conſequence, to alter the conſtitution of the houſe of commons. This fatal attempt has ſucceeded, and ſtands as a precedent recorded for ever. If the miniſtry are unable to defend their cauſe by fair argument founded on facts, let them ſpare us at leaſt the mortification of being amuſed and deluded like children. I believe there is yet a ſpirit of reſiſtance in this country, which will not ſubmit to be oppreſſed; but I am ſure there is a fund of good ſenſe in this country which cannot be deceived.

JUNIUS.

Dr. B——'s POSTSCRIPT †

IN ANSWER TO

JUNIUS's LETTER.

SINCE theſe papers were ſent to the preſs a writer in the public papers, who ſubſcribes himſelf Junius, has made a feint of bringing this queſtion to a ſhort iſſue. Though the foregoing obſervations contain in my opinion at leaſt, a full refutation of all that this writer has offered, I ſhall however, beſtow a very few words upon him. It will indeed coſt me very little trouble, to unravel and expoſe the ſophiſtry of his argument.

"I take the queſtion, ſays he, to be ſtrictly this:" 'Whether or no it be the known eſtabliſhed law of 'parliament, that the expulſion of a member of the 'houſe of Commons of itſelf creates in him ſuch an 'incapacity to be re-elected, that at a ſubſequent 'election, any votes given to him are null and void; 'and that any other candidate, who, except the per-'ſon expelled, has the greateſt number of votes, 'ought to be the ſitting member.'

Waving for the preſent any objection I may have to this ſtate of the queſtion, I ſhall venture to meet our champion upon his own ground: and attempt to ſupport the affirmative of it, in one of the two ways, by which he ſays it can be alone fairly ſupported. 'If there be no ſtatute, ſays he, in which the ſpecific diſability is clearly created, &c. (and we acknowledge there is none) the cuſtom of parliament muſt then be referred to, and ſome caſe or caſes ſtrictly in point, muſt be produced, with the deciſion of the court upon them.' Now I aſſert, that this has been done,

† *Poſtſcript* to his Pamphlet intitled "An Anſwer to the "Queſtion ſtated."

Mr.

Mr. Walpole's caſe is ſtrictly in point, to prove, that expulſion creates abſolute incapacity of being re-elected. This was the clear deciſion of the houſe upon it; and was a full declaration, that incapacity was the neceſſary conſequence of expulſion. The law was as clearly and firmly fixed by this reſolution, and is as binding in every ſubſequent caſe of expulſion, as if it had been declared by an expreſs ſtatute, 'that a member expelled by a reſolution of the houſe of commons ſhall be deemed incapable of being re-elected.' Whatever doubt then there might have been of the law before Mr. Walpole's caſe, with reſpect to the full operation of a vote of expulſion, there can be none now. The deciſion of the houſe upon this caſe is ſtrictly in point to prove, that expulſion creates abſolute incapacity in law of being re-elected.

But incapacity in law in this inſtance muſt have the ſame operation and effect with incapacity in law in every other inſtance: Now incapacity of being re-elected implies, in it's very terms, that any votes given to the incapable perſon, at a ſubſequent election, are null and void. This is it's neceſſary operation, or it has no operation at all. It is *vox et præterea nihil.* We can no more be called upon to prove this propoſition, than we can to prove that a dead man is not alive, or that twice two are four. When the terms are underſtood, the propoſition is ſelf-evident.

Laſtly, It is in all caſes of election the known and eſtabliſhed law of the land, grounded upon the cleareſt principles of reaſon and common ſenſe, that if the votes given to one candidate are null and void, they cannot be oppoſed to the votes given to another candidate. They cannot affect the vote of ſuch candidate at all. As they have, on the one hand, no poſitive quality to add or eſtabliſh, ſo have they on the other hand, no negative one, to ſubſtract or deſtroy. They are, in a word, a mere non-entity. Such was the determination of the houſe of commons in the Malden and Bedford elections; caſes ſtrictly in point

to,

to the preſent Queſtion, as far as they are meant to be in point. And to ſay, that they are not in point, in all circumſtances; in thoſe particularly which are independent of the propoſition which they are quoted to prove, is to ſay no more than that Malden is not Middleſex, nor Serjeant Comyns Mr. Wilkes.

Let us ſee then how our proof ſtands. Expulſion creates incapacity; incapacity annihilates any votes given to the incapable perſon. The votes given to the qualified candidate ſtand upon their own bottom, firm and untouched, and can alone have effect. This, one would think, would be ſufficient. But we are ſtopped ſhort, and told, that none of our precedents come home to the preſent caſe; and are challenged to produce "a precedent in all the proceedings of the houſe of commons that does come home to it, viz. *where an expelled member has been returned again, and another candidate with an inferior number of votes, has been declared the ſitting member.*"

Inſtead of a precedent, I will beg leave to put a caſe; which, I fancy, will be quite as deciſive to the preſent point. Suppoſe another Sacheverel*; (and every party muſt have its Sacheverel) ſhould, at ſome future election, take it into his head, to offer himſelf a candidate for the county of Middleſex. He is oppoſed by a candidate, whoſe coat is of a different colour; but however of a very good colour. The divine has an indiſputable majority; nay, the poor layman is abſolutely diſtanced. The ſheriff, after having had his conſcience well informed by the reverend caſuiſt, returns him, as he ſuppoſes, duly elected. The whole Houſe is in an uproar, at the apprehenſion of ſo ſtrange an appearance amongſt them. A motion however is at length made, that the perſon was incapable of being elected, that his election therefore is null and void, and that his competitor ought

* Why another *Sacheverel*, Doctor? Tempora mutantur!

to

to have been returned. No, ſays a great orator, Firſt, ſhew me your law for this proceeding. "Either produce me a ſtatute, in which the ſpecific diſability of a clergyman is created; or, produce me a precedent, *where a clergyman has been returned, and another candidate, with an inferior number of votes, has been declared the ſitting member.*" No ſuch Statute, no ſuch precedent to be found. What anſwer then is to be given to this demand? The very ſame anſwer which I will give to that of Junius: That there is more than one precedent in the proceedings of the Houſe,—'where an incapable perſon has been 'returned, and another candidate, with an inferior 'number of votes, has been declared the ſitting 'member; and that this is the known and eſtabliſhed 'law, in all caſes of incapacity, from whatever cauſe 'it may ariſe.'

I ſhall now therefore beg leave to make a ſlight amendment to Junius's ſtate of the queſtion; the affirmative of which will then ſtand thus:

'It is the known and eſtabliſhed law of parliament that the expulſion of any member of the 'houſe of commons creates in him an incapacity of 'being re-elected; that any votes given to him at a 'ſubſequent election, are, in conſequence of ſuch incapacity, null and void; and that any other candidate who, except the perſon rendered incapable, 'has the greateſt number of votes, ought to be the 'ſitting member.'

But our buſineſs is not yet quite finiſhed. Mr. Walpole's caſe muſt have a re-hearing. "It is not poſſible, ſays this Writer, to conceive a caſe more exactly in point. Mr. Walpole was expelled, and having a majority of votes at the next election, was returned again. The Friends of Mr. Taylor, a candidate ſet up by the miniſtry, petitioned the houſe, that he might be the ſitting member. Thus far the circumſtances tally exactly, except that our houſe of commons ſaved Mr. Luttrell the trouble of petitioning, The point of law, however, was the ſame.

It

It came regularly before the houſe, and it was their buſineſs to determine upon it. They did determine it; for they declared Mr. Taylor *not duly elected.*"

Inſtead of examining the juſtneſs of this repreſentation, I ſhall beg leave to oppoſe againſt it my own view of this caſe, in as plain a manner and as few words as I am able.

It was the known and eſtabliſhed law of parliament, when the charge againſt Mr. Walpole came before the houſe of commons, that they had power to expel, to diſable, and to render incapable for offences. In virtue of this power they expelled him. Had they, in the very vote of expulſion, adjudged him in terms, to be incapable of being re-elected, there muſt have been at once an end with him. But though the right of the houſe, both to expel, and adjudge incapable, was clear and injubitable, it does not appear to me, that the full operation and effect of a vote of expulſion ſingly was ſo. The law in this caſe had never been expreſly declared. There had been no event to call up ſuch a declaration. I trouble not myſelf with the grammatical meaning of the word expulſion. I regard only its legal meaning. This was not, as I think, preciſely fixed. The houſe thought proper to fix it, and explicitly to declare the full conſequences of their former vote, before they ſuffered theſe conſequences to take effect, And in this proceeding they acted upon the moſt liberal and ſolid principles of equity, juſtice, and law. What then did the burgeſſes of Lynn collect from this ſecond vote? Their ſubſequent conduct will tell us; it will with certainty tell us, that they conſidered it as deciſive againſt Mr. Walpole; it will alſo, with equal certainty, tell us, that, upon ſuppoſition that the law of election ſtood then, as it does now, and that they knew it to ſtand thus, they inferred, "that at a future election, and in caſe of a ſimilar return, the houſe ſhould receive the ſame candidate, as duly elected,

elected, whom they had before rejected." They could infer nothing but this.

It is needleſs to repeat the circumſtance of diſſimilarity in the preſent caſe. It will be ſufficient to obſerve, that as the law of parliament, upon which the houſe of commons grounded every ſtep of their proceedings, was clear beyond the reach of doubt, ſo neither could the Freeholders of Middleſex be at a loſs to foreſee what muſt be the inevitable conſequence of their proceeding in oppoſition to it. For upon every return of Mr. Wilkes, the houſe made enquiry, whether any votes were given to any other candidate.

But I could venture, for the experiment's ſake, even to give this writer the utmoſt he aſks; to allow the moſt perfect ſimilarity throughout in theſe two caſes; to allow, that the law of expulſion was quite as clear to the burgeſſes of Lynn, as to the freeholders of Middleſex. It will, I am confident, avail his cauſe but little. It will only prove, that the law of election at that time was different from the preſent law. It will prove, that, in all caſes of an incapable candidate returned, the law then was, that the whole election ſhould be void. But now we know that this is not law. The caſes of Malden and Bedford were, as has been ſeen, determined upon other and more juſt principles. And theſe determinations are, I imagine, admitted on all ſides, to be law.

I would willingly draw a veil over the remaining part of this paper*. It is aſtoniſhing, it is painful, to ſee men of parts and ability, giving into the moſt unworthy artifices, and deſcending ſo much below their true line of character. But if they are not the dupes of their own ſophiſtry, (which is hardly to be conceived) let them conſider that they are ſomething much worſe.

The deareſt intereſt of this country are its laws and its conſtitution. Againſt every attack upon theſe,

* It is high time he ſhould, having ſaid but little to the purpoſe to ſtrengthen his argument.

there will, I hope, be always found amongſt us the firmeſt *ſpirit of reſiſtance*; ſuperior to the united efforts of faction and ambition. For ambition, though it does not always take the lead of faction, will be ſure in the end to make the moſt fatal advantage of it, and draw it to its own purpoſes. But, I truſt, our day of trial is yet far off; and that there is *a fund of good ſenſe in this country which cannot long be deceived*, by the arts either of falſe reaſoning or falſe patriotiſm.

LET-

LETTER IX.

SIR,

THE gentleman, who has publiſhed an anſwer to Sir William Meredith's pamphlet, having honoured me with a poſtſcript of ſix quarto pages, which he moderately calls, beſtowing *very* few words upon me, I cannot, in common politeneſs, refuſe him a reply. The form and magnitude of a quarto impoſes upon the mind, and men, who are unequal to the labour of diſcuſſing an intricate argument, or wiſh to avoid it, are willing enough to ſuppoſe, that much has been proved, becauſe much has been ſaid. Mine, I confeſs, are humble labours. I do not preſume to inſtruct the learned, but ſimply to inform the body of the people; and I prefer that channel of conveyance, which is likely to ſpread fartheſt among them. The advocates of the miniſtry ſeem to me to write for fame, and to flatter themſelves, that the ſize of their works will make them immortal. They pile up reluctant quarto upon ſolid folio, as if their labours, becauſe they are gigantic, could contend with truth and heaven.

The writer of the volume in queſtion meets me upon my own ground. He acknowledges there is no ſtatute, by which the ſpecific diſability we ſpeak of is created, but he affirms that the cuſtom of parliament has been refered to, and that a caſe ſtrictly in point has been produced, with the deciſion of the court upon it.---I thank him for coming ſo fairly to the point. He aſſerts, that the caſe of Mr. Walpole, is ſtrictly in point to prove that expulſion creates an abſolute incapacity of being re-elected; and for this purpoſe he refers generally to the firſt vote of the houſe upon that

occaſion, without venturing to recite the vote itſelf. The unfair, diſingenuous artifice of adopting that part of a precedent, which ſeems to ſuit his purpoſe, and omitting the remainder, deſerves ſome pity, but cannot excite my reſentment. He takes advantage eagerly of the firſt reſolution, by which Mr. Walpole's incapacity is declared; and as to the two following, by which the candidate with the feweſt votes was declared "not duly elected," and the election itſelf vacated; I dare ſay, he would be well ſatisfied, if they were for ever blotted out of the journals of the houſe of commons. In fair argument, no part of a precedent ſhould be admitted, unleſs the whole of it be given to us together. The author has divided his precedent, for he knew that, taken together, it produced a conſequence directly the reverſe of that, which he endeavours to draw from a vote of expulſion. But what will this honeſt perſon ſay, if I take him at his word, and demonſtrate to him, that the houſe of commons never meant to found Mr. Walpole's incapacity upon his expulſion only? What ſubterfuge will then remain?

Let it be remembered that we are ſpeaking of the intention of men, who lived more than half a century ago, and that ſuch intention can only be collected from their words and actions, as they are delivered to us upon record. To prove their deſigns by a ſuppoſition of what they would have done, oppoſed to what they actually did, is mere trifling and impertinence. The vote, by which Mr. Walpole's incapacity was declared, is thus expreſſed, "That Robert Walpole, "Eſq; having been this ſeſſion of parliament committed a priſoner to the Tower, and expelled this houſe "for a breach of truſt in the execution of his office, "and notorious corruption when a ſecretary at war, "was and is incapable of being elected a member "to ſerve in this preſent parliament *." Now, ſir, to

* It is well worth remarking, that the compiler of a certain quarto, called *The caſe of the laſt election for the county of Middleſex*

to my underſtanding, no propoſition of this kind can be more evident, than that the houſe of commons, by this very vote, themſelves underſtood, and meant to declare, that Mr. Walpole's incapacity aroſe from the crimes he had committed, not from the puniſhment the houſe annexed to them. The high breach of truſt, the notorious corruption are ſtated in the ſtrongeſt terms. They do not tell us he was incapable, becauſe he was expelled, but becauſe he had been guilty of ſuch offences, as juſtly rendered him unworthy of a ſeat in parliament. If they had intended to fix the diſability upon his expulſion alone, the mention of his crimes in the ſame vote, would have been highly improper. It could only perplex the minds of the electors, who, if they collected any thing from ſo confuſed a declaration of the law of parliament, muſt have concluded that their repreſentative had been declared incapable becauſe he was highly guilty, not becauſe he had been puniſhed. But even admitting them to have underſtood it in the other ſenſe, they muſt then, from the very terms of the vote, have united the idea of his being ſent to the Tower with that of his expulſion, and conſidered his incapacity as the joint effect of both.

I do mean to give an opinion upon the juſtice of the proceedings of the houſe of commons, with regard to Mr. Walpole; but certainly, if I admitted their cenſure to be well founded, I could no way avoid agreeing with them in the conſequence they drew from it. I could never have a doubt, in law or reaſon, that a man, convicted of a high breach of truſt, and of a notorious corruption, in the execution of a public

dleſex conſidered, has the impudence to recite this very vote, in the following terms, vide page 2. " Reſolved, that Robert Walpole, " Eſq; having been that ſeſſion of parliament expelled the houſe, ' was and is incapable of being elected a member to ſerve in the pre- " ſent parliament." There cannot be a ſtronger poſitive proof of the treachery of the compiler, nor a ſtronger preſumptive proof that he was convinced that the vote, if truly recited, would overturn his whole argument.

office,

office, was and ought to be incapable of ſitting in the ſame parliament. Far from attempting to invalidate that vote, I ſhould have wiſhed that the incapacity declared by it could legally have been continued for ever.

Now, Sir, obſerve how forcibly the argument returns. The houſe of commons, upon the face of their proceedings, had the ſtrongeſt motives to declare Mr. Walpole incapable of being re-elected. They thought ſuch a man unworthy to ſit among them. To that point they proceeded no further, for they reſpected the rights of the people, while they aſſerted their own. They did not infer, from Mr. Walpole's incapacity, that his opponent was duly elected; on the contrary they declared Mr. Taylor "Not duly elected," and the election itſelf void.

Such, however, is the precedent, which my honeſt friend aſſures us is ſtrictly in point to prove, that expulſion of itſelf creates an incapacity of being elected. If it had been ſo the preſent houſe of commons ſhould at leaſt have followed ſtrictly the example before them, and ſhould have ſtated to us, in the ſame vote, the crimes for which they expelled Mr. Wilkes; whereas they reſolve ſimply, that, "having been expelled, he "was and is incapable." In this proceeding, I am authoriſed to affirm, they have neither ſtatute nor cuſtom, nor reaſon, nor one ſingle precedent to ſupport them. On the other ſide there is indeed a precedent ſo ſtrongly in point, that all the inchanted caſtles of miniſterial magic fall before it. In the year 1698, (a period which the rankeſt tory dare not except againſt) Mr. Wollaſton was expelled, re-elected, and admitted to take his ſeat in the ſame parliament. The miniſtry have precluded themſelves from all objections drawn from the cauſe of his expulſion, for they affirm abſolutely that expulſion of itſelf creates the diſability. Now, Sir, let ſophiſtry evade, let falſehood aſſert, and impudence deny;------ here ſtands the precedent, a land mark to direct us through a troubled ſea of controverſy, conſpicuous and unremoved.

I have

I have dwelt the longer upon the diſcuſſion of this point, becauſe in *my* opinion it comprehends the whole queſtion. The reſt is unworthy of notice. We are enquiring whether incapacity be or be not created by expulſion. In the caſes of Bedford and Malden, the incapacity of the perſons returned was matter of public notoriety, for it was created by act of Parliament. But really, Sir, my honeſt friend's ſuppoſitions are as unfavourable to him as his facts. He well knows that the clergy, beſides that they are repreſented in common with their fellow ſubjects, have alſo a ſeparate parliament of their own;---that their incapacity to ſit in the houſe of commons has been confirmed by repeated deciſions of the houſe, and that the law of parliament, declared by thoſe deciſions, has been for above two centuries notorious and undiſputed. The author is certainly at liberty to fancy caſes, and make whatever compariſons he thinks proper; his ſuppoſitions ſtill continue at a diſtance from fact, as his wild diſcourſes are from ſolid argument.

The concluſion of his book is candid to an extreme. He offers to grant me all I deſire. He thinks he may ſafely admit that the caſe of Mr. Walpole makes directly againſt him, for it ſeems he has one grand ſolution *in petto* for all difficulties. *If*, ſays he, *I were to allow all this, it will only prove; that the law of election was different, in queen Ann's time, from what it is at preſent.*

This indeed is more than I expected. The principle, I know, has been maintained in fact, but I never expected to ſee it ſo formally declared. What can he mean? does he aſſume this language to ſatisfy the doubts of the people, or does he mean to rouſe their indignation; are the miniſtry daring enough to affirm that the houſe of commons have a right to make and unmake the law of parliament at their pleaſure?---Does the law of parliament, which we are ſo often told is the law of the land;---does the common right of every ſubject of the realm depend upon an arbitrary,

bitrary, capricious vote of one branch of the legiſlature; ---The voice of truth and reaſon muſt be ſilent.

The miniſtry tell us plainly that this is no longer a queſtion of right, but of power and force alone. What was law yeſterday is not law to day: and now it ſeems we have no better rule to live by than the temporary diſcretion and fluctuating integrity of the houſe of commons.

Profeſſions of Patriotiſm are become ſtale and ridiculous. For my own part, I claim no merit from endeavouring to do a ſervice to my fellow ſubjects. I have done it to the beſt of my underſtanding; and without looking for the approbation of other men, my conſcience is ſatisfied. What remains to be done concerns the collective body of the people. They are now to determine for themſelves whether they will firmly and conſtitutionally aſſert their rights, or make an humble ſlaviſh ſurrender of them at the feet of the miniſtry. To a generous mind there cannot be a doubt. We owe it to our anceſtors to preſerve entire thoſe rights, which they have delivered to our care; we owe it to our poſterity, not to ſuffer their deareſt inheritance to be deſtroyed. But if it were poſſible for us to be inſenſible of theſe ſacred claims, there is yet an obligation binding upon ourſelves, from which nothing can acquit us,---a perſonal intereſt, which we cannot ſurrender. To alienate even our own rights, would be a crime as much more enormous than ſuicide, as a life of civil ſociety and freedom is ſuperior to a bare exiſtence; and if life be the bounty of heaven, we ſcornfully reject the nobleſt part of the gift, if we conſent to ſurrender that certain rule of living, without which the condition of human nature is not only miſerable, but contemptible.

JUNIUS.

LET-

LETTER X.

To Dr. WILLIAM BLACKSTONE,
SOLICITOR GENERAL to her MAJESTY.

SIR,

I SHALL make you no apology for conſidering a certain pamphlet, in which your late conduct is defended, as written by yourſelf. The perſonal intereſt, the perſonal reſentments, and above all, that wounded ſpirit, unaccuſtomed to reproach, and I hope not frequently conſcious of deſerving it, are ſignals, which betray the author to us as plainly as if your name were in the title page. You appeal to the public in defence of your reputation. We hold it, Sir, that an injury offered to an individual is intereſting to ſociety. On this principle the people of England made common cauſe with Mr. Wilkes. On this principle, if *you* are injured, they will join in your reſentment. I ſhall not follow you through the inſipid form of a third perſon, but addreſs myſelf to you directly.

You ſeem to think the channel of a pamphlet more reſpectable and better ſuited to the dignity of your cauſe, than that of a news-paper. Be it ſo. Yet if news-papers are ſcurrilous, you muſt confeſs they are impartial. They give us, without any apparent preference, the wit and argument of the miniſtry, as well as the abuſive dulneſs of the oppoſition. The ſcales are equally poiſed. It is not the printer's fault if the greater weight inclines the balance.

Your pamphlet then is divided into an attack upon Mr. Grenville's character, and a defence of your own. It would have been more conſiſtent perhaps with your profeſſed intentions, to have confined yourſelf to the laſt. But anger has ſome claim to indulgence, and

railing is uſually a relief to the mind. I hope you have found benefit from the experiment. It is not my deſign to enter into a formal vindication of Mr. Grenville upon his own principles. I have neither the honour of being perſonally known to him, nor do I pretend to be completely maſter of all the facts. I need not run the riſque of doing an injuſtice to his opinions or to his conduct, when your pamphlet alone carries, upon the face of it, a full vindication of both.

Your firſt reflection is that Mr. Grenville was of all men the perſon, who ſhould not have complained of inconſiſtence with regard to Mr. Wilkes. This, Sir, is either an unmeaning ſneer, a peeviſh expreſſion of reſentment, or, if it means any thing, you plainly beg the queſtion; for whether his parliamentary conduct with regard to Mr. Wilkes has or has not been inconſiſtent, remains yet to be proved. But it ſeems he received upon the ſpot a ſufficient chaſtiſement for exerciſing *ſo unfairly* his talent of miſrepreſentation. You are a lawyer, Sir, and know better than I do, upon what particular occaſions a talent for miſrepreſentation may be *fairly* exerted; but to puniſh a man a ſecond time, when he has been once ſufficiently chaſtiſed, is rather too ſevere. It is not in the laws of England; it is not in your own commentaries, nor is it yet I believe in the new law you have revealed to the houſe of commons. I hope this doctrine has no exiſtence but in your own heart. After all, Sir, if you had conſulted that ſober diſcretion, which you ſeem to oppoſe with triumph to the honeſt jollity of a tavern, it might have occurred to you that, although you could have ſucceeded in fixing a charge of inconſiſtence upon Mr. Grenville, it would not have tended in any ſhape to exculpate yourſelf.

Your next inſinuation, that Sir William Meredith, had haſtily adopted the falſe gloſſes of his new Ally is of the ſame ſort with the firſt. It conveys a ſneer

as little worthy of the gravity of your character, as it is uſeleſs to your defence. It is of little moment to the public to enquire by whom the charge was conceived, or by whom it was adopted. The only queſtion we aſk is, whether or not it be true. The remainder of your reflections upon Mr. Grenville's conduct deſtroy themſelves. He could not poſſibly come prepared to traduce your integrity to the houſe. He could not foreſee that you would even ſpeak upon the queſtion, much leſs could he foreſee that you would maintain a direct contradiction of that doctrine, which you had ſolemnly, diſintereſtedly, and upon ſobereſt reflection delivered to the public. He came armed indeed with what he thought a reſpectable authority, to ſupport what he was convinced was the cauſe of truth, and I doubt not he intended to give you, in the courſe of the debate, an honourable and public teſtimony of his eſteem. Thinking highly of his abilities, I cannot however allow him the gift of divination. As to what you are pleaſed to call a plan cooly formed to impoſe upon the houſe of commons, and his producing it without provocation at midnight. I conſider it as the language of pique and invective, therefore unworthy of regard. But Sir, I am ſenſible I have followed your example too long, and wandered from the point.

The quotation from your commentaries is matter of record. It can neither be *altered* by your friends, nor miſrepreſented by your enemies, and I am willing to take your own word for what you ſaid in the houſe of commons. If there be a real difference between what you have written and what you have ſpoken, you confeſs that your book ought to be the ſtandard. Now, Sir, if words mean any thing, I apprehend that when a long enumeration of diſqualifications (whether by ſtatute or by cuſtom of parliament) concludes with theſe general comprehenſive words, 'but ſub-'ject to theſe reſtrictions and diſqualifications, *every* 'ſubject of the realm is eligible of common right,'

a reader of a plain underſtanding muſt of courſe reſt ſatisfied that no ſpecies of diſqualifications whatſoever had been omitted. The known character of the author, and the apparent accuracy with which the whole work is compiled, would confirm him in his opinion; nor could he poſſibly form any other judgement, without looking upon your commentaries in the ſame light in which you conſider thoſe penal laws, which though not repealed are fallen into diſuſe, and are now in effect A SNARE TO THE UNWARY.

You tell us indeed that it was not part of your plan to ſpecify any temporary incapacity, and that you could not, without a ſpirit of prophecy, have ſpecified the diſability of a private individual, ſubſequent to the period at which you wrote. What your plan was I know not; but what it ſhould have been, in order to compleat the work you have given us, is by no means difficult to determine. The incapacity, which you call temporary, may continue ſeven years; and tho' you might not have foreſeen the particular caſe of Mr. Wilkes, you might and ſhould have foreſeen the poſſibility of *ſuch* a caſe, and told us how far the houſe of commons were authorized to proceed in it by the law and cuſtom of parliament. The freeholders of Middleſex would then have known what they had to truſt to, and would never have returned Mr. Wilkes, when colonel Luttrell was a candidate againſt him. They would have choſe ſome indifferent perſon rather than ſubmit to be repreſented by the object of their contempt and deteſtation.

Your attempt to diſtinguiſh between diſabilities, which affect whole claſſes of men, and thoſe which affect individuals only, is really unworthy of your underſtanding. Your commentaries had taught me that, although the inſtance, in which a penal law is exerted, be particular, the laws themſelves are general. They are made for the benefit and inſtruction of the public, though the penalty falls only upon an individual. You cannot but know, Sir, that what

was

was Mr. Wilkes's caſe yeſterday may be your's or mine to-morrow, and that conſequently the common right of every ſubject of the realm is invaded by it. Profeſſing therefore to treat of the conſtitution of the houſe of commons, and of the laws and cuſtoms re-relative to that conſtitution, you certainly were guilty of a moſt unpardonable omiſſion, in taking no notice of a right and privilege of the houſe, more extraordinary and more arbitrary than all the others they poſſeſs put together. If the expulſion of a member, not under any other legal diſability, of itſelf creates in him an incapacity to be re-elected, I ſee a ready way marked out, by which the majority may at any time remove the honeſteſt and ableſt men who happen to be in oppoſition to them. To ſay that they *will not* make this extravagant uſe of their power, would be language unfit for a man ſo learned in the laws as you are. By your doctrine, Sir, they *have* the power, and laws you know are intended to guard againſt what men *may* do, not to truſt to what they will do.

Upon the whole, Sir, the charge againſt you is of a plain, ſimple nature: It appears even upon the face of your own pamphlet. On the contrary, your juſtification of yourſelf is full of ſubtlety and refinement, and in ſome places not very intelligible. If I were perſonally your enemy, I ſhould dwell, with a malignant pleaſure, upon thoſe great and uſeful qualifications, which you certainly poſſeſs, and by which you once acquired, though they could not preſerve to you the reſpect and eſteem of your country, I ſhould enumerate the honours you have loſt, and the virtues you have diſgraced: But having no private reſentments to gratify, I think it ſufficient to have given my opinion of your public conduct, leaving the puniſhment it deſerves to your cloſet and to yourſelf.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XI.

SIR,

I Muſt beg of you to print a few lines, in explanation of ſome paſſages in my laſt letter, which I ſee have been miſunderſtood.

1. When I ſaid, that the houſe of commons never meant to found Mr. Walpole's incapacity on his expulſion *only*, I meant no more than to deny the general propoſition, that expulſion *alone* creates the incapacity. If there be any thing ambiguous in the expreſſion, I beg leave to explain it by ſaying, that, in my opinion, expulſion neither creates, nor in any part contributes to create the incapacity in queſtion.

2. I carefully avoided entering into the merits of Mr. Walpole's caſe. I did not enquire, whether the houſe of commons acted juſtly, or whether they truly declared the law of parliament. My remarks went only to their apparent meaning and intention, as it ſtands declared in their own reſolution.

3. I never meant to affirm, that a commitment to the Tower created a diſqualification. On the contrary, I conſidered that idea as an abſurdity into which the miniſtry muſt inevitably fall, if they reaſoned right upon their own principles.

The caſe of Mr. Wollaſton ſpeaks for itſelf. The miniſtry aſſert that expulſion alone creates an abſolute, complete incapacity to be re-elected to ſit in the ſame parliament. This propoſition they have uniformly maintained, without any condition or modification whatſoever. Mr. Wollaſton was expelled, re-elected, and admitted to take his ſeat in the ſame parliament.——I leave it to the public to determine, whether this be a plain matter of fact, or mere nonſenſe and declamation.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XII.

To his Grace the Duke of ———.

My LORD,

YOU are ſo little accuſtomed to receive any marks of reſpect or eſteem from the public, that if, in the following lines, a compliment or expreſſion of applauſe ſhould eſcape me, I fear you would conſider it as a mockery of your eſtabliſhed character, and perhaps an inſult to your underſtanding. You have nice feelings, my Lord, if we may judge from your reſentments. Cautious therefore of giving offence, where you have ſo little deſerved it, I ſhall leave the illuſtration of your virtues to other hands. Your friends have a privilege to play upon the eaſineſs of your temper, or poſſibly they are better acquainted with your good qualities than I am. You have done good by ſtealth. The reſt is upon record. You have ſtill left ample room for ſpeculation, when panegyric is exhauſted.

You are indeed a very conſiderable man. The higheſt rank;—a ſplendid fortune; and a name, glorious till it was yours, were ſufficient to have ſupported you with meaner abilities than I think you poſſeſs. From the firſt, you derived a conſtitutional claim to reſpect; from the ſecond, a natural extenſive authority;—the laſt created a partial expectation of hereditary virtues. The uſe you have made of theſe uncommon advantages might have been more honourable to yourſelf, but could not be more inſtructive to mankind. We may trace it in the veneration of your country, the choice of your friends, and

and in the accompliſhment of every ſanguine hope, which the public might have conceived from the illuſtrious name of R———l.

The eminence of your ſtation gave you a commanding proſpect of your duty. The road, which led to honour, was open to your view. You could not loſe it by miſtake, and you had no temptation to depart from it by deſign. Compare the natural dignity and importance of the richeſt Peer of England;—the noble independence, which he might have maintained in parliament; and the real intereſt and reſpect, which he might have acquired, not only in parliament, but through the whole kingdom; compare theſe glorious diſtinctions with the ambition of holding a ſhare in government, the emoluments of a place, the ſale of a borough, or the purchaſe of a corporation; and though you may not regret the virtues, which create reſpect, you may ſee, with anguiſh, how much real importance and authority you have loſt. Conſider the character of an independent virtuous Duke of ———; imagine what he might be in this country, then reflect one moment upon what you are. If it be poſſible for me to withdraw my attention from the fact, I will tell you in theory what ſuch a man might be.

Conſcious of his own weight and importance, his conduct in parliament would be directed by nothing but the conſtitutional duty of a peer. He would conſider himſelf as a guardian of the laws. Willing to ſupport the juſt meaſures of government, but determined to obſerve the conduct of the miniſter with ſuſpicion, he would oppoſe the violence of faction with as much firmneſs, as the encroachments of prerogative. He would be as little capable of bargaining with the miniſter for places for himſelf, or his dependants, as of deſcending to mix himſelf in the intrigues of oppoſition. Whenever an important queſtion called for his opinion in parliament, he would be heard, by the moſt profligate miniſter, with

deference

deference and reſpect. His authority would either ſanctify or diſgrace the meaſures of government.—The people would look up to him as to their protector, and a virtuous prince would have one honeſt man in his dominions, in whoſe integrity and judgment he might ſafely confide. If it ſhould be the will of providence to afflict him with a domeſtic misfortune, he would ſubmit to the ſtroke, with feeling, but not without dignity. He would conſider the people as his children, and receive a generous heart-felt conſolation, in the ſympathiſing tears, and bleſſings of his country.

Your Grace may probably diſcover ſomething more intelligible in the negative part of this illuſtrious character. The man I have deſcribed would never proſtitute his dignity in parliament by an indecent violence either in oppoſing or defending a miniſter. He would not at one moment rancorouſly perſecute, at another baſely cringe to the favourite of his S——n. After outraging the royal dignity with peremptory conditions, little ſhort of menace and hoſtility, he would never deſcend to the humility of ſoliciting an interview with the Favourite, and of offering to recover, at any price, the honour of his friendſhip. Though deceived perhaps in his youth, he would not, through the courſe of a long life, have invariably choſen his friends from among the moſt profligate of mankind. His own honour would have forbidden him from mixing his private pleaſures or converſation with jockeys, gameſters, blaſphemers, gladiators, or buffoons. He would then have never felt, much leſs would he have ſubmitted to the humiliating diſhoneſt neceſſity, of engaging in the intereſts and intrigues of his dependants, of ſupplying their v ces, or relieving their beggary, at the expence of his country. He would not have betrayed ſuch ignorance, or ſuch contempt of the conſtitution, as openly to avow, in a court of juſtice, the purchaſe and ſale of a borough. He would not have thought it conſiſtent with his

rank in the ſtate, or even with his perſonal importance, to be the little tyrant of a little corporation. He would never have been inſulted with virtues, which he had laboured to extinguiſh, nor ſuffered the diſgrace of a mortifying defeat, which has made him ridiculous and contemptible, even to the few by whom he was not deteſted. — I reverence the afflictions of a good man—his ſorrows are ſacred. But how can we take part in the diſtreſſes of a man, whom we can neither love nor eſteem; or feel for a calamity, of which he himſelf is inſenſible. Where was the father's heart, when he could look for, or find an immediate conſolation for the loſs of an only ſon, in conſultations and bargains for a place at court, and even in the miſery of balloting at the India Houſe!

Admitting then that you have miſtaken or deſerted thoſe honourable principles, which ought to have directed your conduct; admitting that you have as little claim to private affection as to public eſteem, let us ſee with what abilities, with what degree of judgment you have carried your own ſyſtem into execution. A great man, in the ſucceſs and even in the magnitude of his crimes, finds a reſcue from contempt. Your Grace is every way unfortunate. Yet I will not look back to thoſe ridiculous ſcenes, by which, in your earlier days, you thought it an honour to be diſtinguiſhed; the recorded ſtripes, the public infamy, your own ſufferings, or Mr. R----'s fortitude. Theſe events undoubtedly left an impreſſion, though not upon your mind. To ſuch a mind, it may perhaps be a pleaſure to reflect, that there is hardly a corner of any of his Majeſty's kingdoms, except France, in which, at one time or other, your valuable life has not been in danger. Amiable man! we ſee and acknowledge the protection of providence, by which you have ſo often eſcaped the perſonal deteſtation of your fellow ſubjects, and

are

are ſtill reſerved for the public juſtice of your country.

Your hiſtory begins to be important at that auſpicious period, at which you were deputed to repreſent the Earl of Bute, at the court of Verſailles. It was an honourable office, and executed with the ſame ſpirit with which it was accepted. Your patrons wanted an ambaſſador, who would ſubmit to make conceſſions, without daring to inſiſt upon any honourable condition for his Sovereign. Their buſineſs required a man, who had as little feeling for his own dignity, as for the welfare of his country; and they found him in the firſt rank of the nobility. Belleiſle, Goree, Guadaloupe, St. Lucia, Martinique, the Fiſhery, and the Havanna, are glorious monuments of your Grace's talents for negotiation. My Lord, we are too well acquainted with your pecuniary character, to think it poſſible that ſo many public ſacrifices ſhould have been made, without ſome private compenſations. Your conduct carries with it an interior evidence, beyond all the legal proofs of a court of juſtice. Even the callous pride of Lord Egremont was alarmed. He ſaw and felt his own diſhonour in correſponding with you; and there certainly was a moment, at which he meant to have reſiſted, had not a fatal lethargy prevailed over his faculties, and carried all ſenſe and memory away with it.

I will not pretend to ſpecify the ſecret terms on which you were invited to ſupport an adminiſtration which Lord Bute pretended to leave in full poſſeſſion of their miniſterial authority, and perfectly maſters of themſelves. He was not of a temper to relinquiſh power, though he retired from employment. Stipulations were certainly made between your Grace and him, and certainly violated. After two years ſubmiſſion, you thought you had collected a ſtrength ſufficient to controul his influence, and that it was your turn to be a tyrant, becauſe you had been

a ſlave. When you found yourſelf miſtaken in your opinion of your gracious Maſter's firmneſs, diſappointment got the better of all your humble diſcretion, and carried you to an exceſs of outrage to his perſon, as diſtant from true ſpirit, as from all decency and reſpect. After robbing him of the rights of a King, you would not permit him to preſerve the honour of a Gentleman. It was then Lord Weymouth was nominated to Ireland, and diſpatched (we well remember with what indecent hurry) to plunder the treaſury of the firſt fruits of an employment which you well knew he was never to execute.

This ſudden declaration of war againſt the Favourite, might have given you a momentary merit with the public, if it had either been adopted upon principle, or maintained with reſolution. Without looking back to all your former ſervility, we need only obſerve your ſubſequent conduct, to ſee upon what motives you acted. Apparently united with Mr. Grenville, you waited until Lord Rockingham's feeble adminiſtration ſhould diſſolve in its own weakneſs. —The moment their diſmiſſion was ſuſpected, the moment you perceived that another ſyſtem was adopted in the cloſet; you thought it no diſgrace to return to your former dependance, and ſolicit once more the friendſhip of Lord Bute. You begged an interview, at which he had ſpirit enough to treat you with contempt.

It would now be of little uſe to point out, by what a train of weak, injudicious meaſures, it became neceſſary, or was thought ſo, to call you back to a ſhare in the adminiſtration. The Friends, whom you did not in the leaſt inſtance deſert, were not of a character to add ſtrength or credit to Government; and at that time your alliance with the Duke of Grafton was, I preſume, hardly foreſeen. We muſt look for other ſtipulations, to account for that ſudden reſolution of the cloſet, by which three of your dependants (whoſe characters, I think, cannot be leſs reſpected

ſpected than they are) were advanced to offices, through which you might again controul the miniſter, and probably engroſs the whole direction of affairs.

The poſſeſſion of abſolute power is now once more within your reach. The meaſures you have taken to obtain and confirm it, are too groſs to eſcape the eyes of a diſcerning judicious prince. His palace is beſieged; the lines of circumvallation are drawing round him; and unleſs he finds a reſource in his own activity, or in the attachment of the real friends of his family, the beſt of princes muſt ſubmit to the confinement of a ſtate priſoner, until your Grace's death, or ſome leſs fortunate event, ſhall raiſe the ſiege. For the preſent, you may ſafely reſume that ſtile of inſult and menace, which even a private gentleman cannot ſubmit to hear without being contemptible. Mr. Mackenzie's hiſtory is not yet forgotten, and you may find precedents enough of the mode in which an imperious ſubject may ſignify his pleaſure to his ſovereign. Where will this gracious monarch look for aſſiſtance, when the wretched G———n could forget his obligations to his maſter, and deſert him for a hollow alliance with *ſuch* a man as the Duke of—.

Let us conſider you, then, as arrived at the ſummit of worldly greatneſs: let us ſuppoſe, that all your plans of avarice and ambition are accompliſhed, and your moſt ſanguine wiſhes gratified in the fear, as well as the hatred of the people: Can Age itſelf forget that you are now in the laſt act of life? Can grey hairs make folly venerable? and is there no period to be reſerved for meditation and retirement? For ſhame! my Lord: Let it not be recorded of you, that the lateſt moments of your life were dedicated to the ſame unworthy purſuits, the ſame buſy agitations, in which your youth and manhood were exhauſted. Conſider that, although you cannot diſgrace your former life, you are violating the

character

character of age, and expoſing the impotent imbecility, after you have loſt the vigour of the paſſions.

Your friends will aſk, perhaps, whether ſhall this unhappy old man retire? Can he remain in the metropolis, where his life has been often threatened, and his palace ſo often attacked? If he returns to W——n, ſcorn and mockery await him. He muſt create a ſolitude round his eſtate, if he would avoid the face of reproach and deriſion. At Plymouth, his deſtruction would be more than probable; at Exeter, inevitable. No honeſt Engliſhman will ever forget his attachment, nor any honeſt Scotchman forgive his treachery to Lord Bute. At every town he enters, he muſt change his liveries and his name. Which ever way he flies, the *Hue and Cry* of the country purſues him.

In another kingdom indeed, the bleſſings of his adminiſtration have been more ſenſibly felt;—his virtues better underſtood;—or at worſt, they will not, for him alone, forget their hoſpitality.——As well might VERRES have returned to Sicily. You have twice eſcaped, my Lord; beware of a third experiment. The indignation of a whole people, plundered, inſulted, and oppreſſed as they have been, will not always be diſappointed.

It is in vain therefore to ſhift the ſcene. You can no more fly from your enemies than from your ſelf. Perſecuted abroad, you look into your own heart for conſolation, and find nothing but reproaches and deſpair. But, my Lord, you may quit the field of buſineſs, though not the field of danger; and though you cannot be ſafe, you may ceaſe to be ridiculous. I fear you have liſtened too long to the advice of thoſe pernicious friends, with whoſe intereſts you have ſordidly united your own, and for whom you have ſacrificed every thing that ought to be dear to a man of honour. They are ſtill baſe enough to encourage the follies of your age, as

the

they once did the vices of your youth. As little acquainted with the rules of decorum, as with the laws of morality, they will not ſuffer you to profit by experience, nor even to conſult the propriety of a bad character. Even now they tell you, that life is no more than a dramatic ſcene, in which the hero ſhould preſerve his conſiſtency to the laſt, and that as you lived without virtue, you ſhould die without repentance.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XIII.

To JUNIUS.

SIR,

HAVING accidentally ſeen a *republication* of your letters, wherein you have been pleaſed to *aſſert*, that I had *ſold* the companions of my ſucceſs; I am again obliged to declare the ſaid aſſertion to be a moſt *infamous* and *malicious falſehood*; and I *again* call upon you to ſtand forth, avow yourſelf, and *prove* the charge. If you can make it out to the ſatisfaction of any one man in the kingdom, I will be content to be thought the worſt man in it; if you do not, what muſt the nation think of you? *Party* has nothing to do in this affair: You have made a perſonal attack upon my honour, defamed me by a moſt vile calumny, which might poſſibly have ſunk into oblivion, had not ſuch uncommon pains been taken to renew and perpetuate this ſcandal, chiefly becauſe it has been told in good language: For I give you full credit for your elegant diction, well turned periods, and attic wit; but wit is oftentimes falſe, though it may appear brilliant; which is exactly the caſe of your *whole performance*. But, Sir, I am obliged in the moſt *ſerious* manner to

accuſe

accuſe you of being guilty of *falſities*. You have ſaid the thing that is *not*. To ſupport your ſtory, you have recourſe to the following *irreſiſtible* argument: 'You *ſold* the companions of your victory, becauſe when the ſixteenth regiment was given to *you*, you was *ſilent*.' The concluſion is inevitable. I believe that ſuch *deep* and *acute reaſoning* could only come from ſuch an extraordinary writer as *Junius*. But unfortunately for you, the *premiſes* as well as the *concluſion* are abſolutely *falſe*. Many applications have been made to the miniſtry on the ſubject of the Manilla Ranſom *ſince* the time of my being colonel of that regiment. As I have for ſome years quitted London, I was obliged to have recourſe to the honourable colonel Monſon and Sir Samuel Corniſh to *negotiate* for me: In the laſt autumn I perſonally delivered a memorial to the earl of Shelburne at his ſeat in Wiltſhire. As you have told us of your importance, that you are a perſon of *rank* and *fortune*, and above a *common* bribe, you may in all probability be not *unknown* to his lordſhip, who can ſatisfy you of the truth of what I ſay. But I ſhall now take the liberty, Sir, to ſeize your battery, and turn it againſt yourſelf. If your puerile and tinſel logic could carry the leaſt weight or conviction with it, how muſt *you* ſtand affected by the *inevitable coucluſion*, as you are pleaſed to term it? According to *Junius*, *Silence* is *Guilt*. In many of the public papers, you have been called in the moſt direct and offenſive terms a *liar* and a *coward*. When did you reply to theſe foul accuſations? You have been quite *ſilent*; quite chop-fallen: Therefore, *becauſe* you was *ſilent*, the nation has a right to pronounce you to be both a liar and a coward from your own argument. But, Sir, I will give you fair play; will afford you an opportunity to wipe off the firſt appellation; by deſiring the proofs of your charge againſt me. Produce them! To wipe off the laſt, produce *yourſelf*. People cannot bear any longer your *lion's ſkin*, and the deſpicable *impoſture* of the *old Roman*

name

name which you have *affected*. For the future aſſume the name of ſome *modern* bravo and dark aſſaſſin: Let your appellation have ſome affinity to your practice. But if I muſt *periſh*, *Junius*, let me *periſh* in the face of day; be for *once* a generous and open enemy. I allow that gothic *appeals* to cold iron are no better proofs of a man's honeſty and veracity than hot iron and burning ploughſhares are of *female chaſtity*: But a ſoldier's honour is as delicate as a woman's; it muſt not be ſuſpected; you have dared to throw more than a ſuſpicion upon mine: You cannot but know the conſequences, which even the meekneſs of chriſtianity would pardon me for, after the injury you have done me.

WILLIAM DRAPER.

LETTER XIV.

Hæret lateri lethalis arundo.

To Sir WILLIAM DRAPER, KNIGHT of the BATH.

SIR,

AFTER ſo long an interval, I did not expect to ſee the debate revived between us. My anſwer to your laſt letter ſhall be ſhort; for I write to you with reluctance, and I hope we ſhall now conclude our correſpondence for ever.

Had you been originally and without provocation attacked by an anonymous writer, you would have ſome right to demand his name. But in this caſe you are a volunteer. You engaged in it with the unpremeditated Gallantry of a ſoldier. You were content to ſet your name in oppoſition to a man, who would probably continue in concealment. You underſtood the terms, upon which we were to correſpond, and gave at leaſt a tacit aſſent to them. After voluntarily attacking me under the character of Junius, what poſſible right have you to know me under any other? Will you forgive me if I inſinuate to you, that you foreſaw ſome honour in the apparent ſpirit of coming forward in perſon, and that you were not quite indifferent to the diſplay of your literary qualifications?

You cannot but know that the republication of my letters was no more than a catchpenny * contrivance of a Printer, in which it was impoſſible I ſhould be concerned, and for which I am no way anſwerable. At the ſame time I wiſh you to underſtand, that if I do not

* The editor's motive, for this republication, is otherwiſe expreſſed in his preface to theſe letters.

take

take the trouble of reprinting theſe papers, it is not from any fear of giving offence to Sir William Draper.

Your remarks upon a ſignature, adopted merely for diſtinction, are unworthy of notice; but when you tell me I have ſubmitted to be called a lyar and a coward, I muſt aſk you in my turn, whether you ſeriouſly think it any way incumbent upon me to take notice of the ſilly invectives of every ſimpleton, who writes in a news-paper; and what opinion you would have conceived of my diſcretion, if I had ſuffered myſelf to be the dupe of ſo ſhallow an artifice?

Your appeal to the ſword, though conſiſtent enough with your late profeſſion, will neither prove your innocence nor clear you from ſuſpicion.—Your complaints with regard to the Manilla ranſom were, for a conſiderable time, a diſtreſs to government. You were appointed (greatly out of your turn) to the command of a regiment, and *during that adminiſtration* we heard no more of Sir William Draper. The facts, of which I ſpeak, may indeed be variouſly accounted for, but they are too notorious to be denied, and I think you might have learnt at the univerſity, that a falſe concluſion is an error in argument, not a breach of veracity. Your ſolicitations, I doubt not, were renewed under *another* adminiſtration. Admitting the fact, I fear an indifferent perſon would only infer from it, that experience had made you acquainted with the benefits of complaining. Remember, Sir, that you have yourſelf confeſſed, that, *conſidering the critical ſituation of this country, the miniſtry are in the right to temporiſe with Spain.* This confeſſion reduces you to an unfortunate dilemma. By renewing your ſolicitations, you muſt either mean to force your country into a war at a moſt unſeaſonable juncture; or, having no view or expectation of that kind, that you look for nothing but a private compenſation to yourſelf.

As to me, it is by no means neceſſary that I ſhould be expoſed to the reſentment of the worſt and the

moſt powerful men in this country, though I may be indifferent about yours. Though *you* would fight, there are others who would aſſaſſinate.

But after all, Sir, where is the injury? You aſſure me, that my logic is puerile and tinſel, that it carries not the leaſt weight or conviction, that my premiſes are falſe and my concluſions abſurd. If this be a juſt deſcription of me, how is it poſſible for ſuch a writer to diſturb your peace of mind, or injure a character ſo well eſtabliſhed as yours? Take care, Sir William, how you indulge this unruly temper, leſt the world ſhould ſuſpect that conſcience has ſome ſhare in your reſentments. You have more to fear from the treachery of your own paſſions, than from any malevolence of mine.

I believe, Sir, you will never know me. A conſiderable time muſt certainly elapſe before we are perſonally acquainted You need not however regret the delay, or ſuffer an apprehenſion that any length of time can reſtore you to the chriſtian meekneſs of your temper, and diſappoint your preſent indignation. If I underſtand your character, there is in your own breaſt a repoſitory, in which your reſentments may be ſafely laid up for future occaſions and preſerved without the hazard of diminution. The *Odia in longum jaciens, quæ reconderet, auctaque promeret*, I thought had only belonged to the worſt character of antiquity. The text is in Tacitus?—you know beſt where to look for the commentary.

JUNIUS.

LET-

LETTER XV.

A WORD at Parting to JUNIUS,

By Sir WILLIAM DRAPER.

SIR, Clifton, Oct. 2d.

AS you have not favoured me with either of the explanations demanded of you, I can have nothing more to ſay to you upon my own account. Your mercy to me, or tenderneſs for yourſelf, has been very great. The public will judge of your motives. If your exceſs of modeſty forbids you to produce either the proofs, or yourſelf, I will excuſe it. Take courage, I have not the temper of Tiberius, any more than the rank of power. You, indeed, are a tyrant of another ſort, and upon your political bed of torture, can excruciate any ſubject, from a firſt Miniſter down to ſuch a Grub or Butterfly as myſelf. Like another deteſted tyrant of antiquity, can make the wretched ſufferer fit the bed, if the bed will not fit the ſufferer, by disjointing or tearing the trembling limbs, until they are ſtretched to its extremity. But courage, conſtancy, and patience, under torments, have ſometimes cauſed the moſt hardened monſters to relent and forgive the object of their cruelty. You, Sir, are determined to try all that human nature can endure, until ſhe expires: Elſe was it poſſible that you could be the author of that moſt inhuman letter to the Duke of -------? I have read with aſtoniſhment and horror; where, Sir, where were the feelings of your own heart, when you could upbraid a moſt affectionate father with the loſs of his only and moſt amiable ſon? Read over again thoſe cruel lines of yours, and let them wring your very ſoul! Cannot political queſtions be diſcuſſed without deſcending to the moſt odious perſonalities? Muſt you go wantonly out of your way to torment declining age, becauſe the Duke of ------- may have quarrelled with thoſe whoſe cauſe and politics you eſpouſe? For ſhame! for

ſhame!

ſhame! As you have ſpoke daggers to him, you may juſtly dread the uſe of them againſt your own breaſt, did a want of courage, or of noble ſentiments ſtimulate him to ſuch mean revenge? He is above it; he is brave. Do you fancy that your own baſe arts have infected our whole iſland? But your own reflections, your own conſcience, muſt and will, if you have any ſpark of humanity remaining, give him moſt ample vengeance. Not all the power of words, with which you are ſo graced, will ever waſh out, or even palliate, this foul blot in your character. I have not time at preſent to diſſect your letter ſo minutely as I could wiſh, but I will be bold enough to ſay, that it is (as to reaſon and argument) the moſt extraordinary piece of florid impotence that was ever impoſed upon the eyes and ears of the too credulous and deluded mob. It accuſes the Duke of --------- of high treaſon. Upon what foundation? You tell us "that the Duke's pecuniary character makes it more than probable, that he could not have made ſuch ſacrifices at the peace, without ſome private compenſations: that his conduct carried with it an interior evidence, beyond all the legal proofs of a Court of Juſtice."

My academical education, Sir, bids me tell you that it is neceſſary to eſtabliſh the truth of your firſt propoſition, before you preſume to draw inferences from it. Firſt prove the avarice, before you make the raſh, haſty, and moſt wicked concluſion. This father, Junius, whom you call avaricious, allowed that ſon eight thouſand pounds a year. Upon his moſt unfortunate death, which your uſual good nature took care to remind him of, he greatly increaſed the jointure of the afflicted Lady, his widow. Is this avarice? Is this doing good by ſtealth? It is upon record.

If exact order, method, and true œconomy, as maſter of a family; if ſplendor and juſt magnificence, without wild waſte and thoughtleſs extravagance, may conſtitute the character of an avaricious man, the Duke is guilty. But for a moment, let us admit

admit that an ambaſſador may love money too much; what proof do you give that he has taken any to betray his country? Is it hear-ſay; or the evidence of letters, or ocular, or the evidence of thoſe concerned in this black affair? Produce your authorities to the public. It is a moſt impudent kind of ſorcery to attempt to blind us with the ſmoke, without convincing us that the fire has exiſted. You firſt brand him with a vice that he is free from, to render him odious and ſuſpected. Suſpicion is the foul weapon with which you make all your chief attacks; with that you ſtab. But ſhall one of the firſt ſubjects of the realm be ruined in his fame; ſhall even his life be in conſtant danger from a charge built upon ſuch ſandy foundations? Muſt his houſe be beſieged by lawleſs ruffians, his journies impeded, and even the aſylum of an altar not ſecure from aſſertions ſo baſe and falſe? Potent as he is, the Duke is amenable to juſtice, if guilty, puniſhable. The parliament is the high and ſolemn tribunal for matters of ſuch great moment. To that be they ſubmitted. But I hope alſo that ſome notice will be taken of, and ſome puniſhment inflicted upon falſe accuſers, eſpecially upon ſuch as Junius, who are wilfully falſe. In any truth I will agree even with Junius; will agree with him that it is highly unbecoming the dignity of Peers to tamper with boroughs. Ariſtocracy is as fatal as democracy. Our conſtitution admits of neither. It loves a King, Lords and Commons, really choſen by the unbought ſuffrages of a free people. But if corruption only ſhifts hands; if the wealthy Commoner gives the bribe, inſtead of the potent Peer, is the State better ſerved by this exchange? Is the real emancipations of the borough effected, becauſe new parchment bonds may poſſibly ſupercede the old? To ſay the Truth, wherever ſuch practices prevail, they are equally criminal to, and deſtructive of our freedom.

The reſt of your declamation is ſcarce worth conſidering, excepting for the elegance of the language.

Like

Like Hamlet in the play, you produce two pictures; you tell us that one is not like the Duke of ---- ----, then you bring a moſt hideous caricatura, and tell us of the reſemblance; but 'multum abludit imago.'

All your long tedious accounts of the miniſterial quarrels, and the intrigues of the cabinet are reducible to a few ſhort lines; and to convince you, Sir, that I do not mean to flatter any Miniſter, either paſt or preſent: Theſe are my thoughts: They ſeem to have acted like lovers, or children; have pouted, quarrelled, cried, kiſſed, and been friends again, as the objects of deſire, the miniſterial rattles, have been put into their hands. But ſuch proceedings are very unworthy of the gravity and dignity of a great nation. We do not want men of abilities; but we have wanted ſteadineſs; we want unanimity: Your letters, Junius, will not contribute thereto. You may one day expire by a flame of your own kindling. But it is my humble opinion that lenity and moderation, pardon and oblivion, will diſappoint the efforts of all the ſeditious in the land; and extinguiſh their wide ſpreading fires. I have lived with this ſentiment, with this I ſhall die.

WILLIAM DRAPER.

LETTER XVI.

SIR,

IF Sir William Draper's bed be a bed of torture, he has made it for himself. I ſhall never interrupt his repoſe. Having changed the ſubject, there are parts of his laſt letter not undeſerving of a reply. Leaving his private character and conduct out of the queſtion, I ſhall conſider him merely in the capacity of an author, whoſe labours certainly do no diſcredit to a news paper.

We ſay, in common diſcourſe, that a man may be his own enemy, and the frequency of the fact makes the expreſſion intelligible. But that a man ſhall be the bittereſt enemy of his friends, implies a contradiction of a peculiar nature. There is ſomething in it, which cannot be conceived without a confuſion of ideas, nor expreſſed without a ſoleciſm in language. Sir William Draper is ſtill that fatal friend Lord Granby found him: yet I am ready to do juſtice to his generoſity, if indeed it be not ſomething more than generous, to be the voluntary advocate of men, who think themſelves injured by his aſſiſtance, and to conſider nothing in the cauſe he adopts, but the difficulty of defending it. I thought however, he had been better read in the hiſtory of the human heart, than to compare or confound the tortures of the body with thoſe of the mind. He ought to have known, tho' perhaps it might not be his intereſt to confeſs, that no outward tyranny can reach the mind. If conſcience plays the tyrant, it would be greatly for the benefit of the world, that ſhe were more arbitrary, and far leſs placable, than ſome men find her.

But it ſeems I have outraged the feelings of a father's heart.—Am I indeed ſo injudicious? Does Sir William Draper think I would have hazarded my credit with a generous nation, by ſo groſs a violation of the laws of humanity? Does he think I am ſo little acquainted with the firſt and nobleſt characteriſtic of Engliſhmen? Or how will he reconcile ſuch folly with an underſtanding ſo full of artifice as mine? Had *he* been a father, he would have been but little offended with the ſeverity of the reproach, for his mind would have been filled with the juſtice of it. He would have ſeen that I did not inſult the feelings of a father, but the father who felt nothing. He would have truſted to the evidence of his own paternal heart, and boldly denied the poſſibility of the fact, inſtead of defending it. Againſt whom then will his honeſt indignation be directed, when I aſſure him, that this whole town beheld the D— of ——'s conduct, upon the death of his ſon, with horror and aſtoniſhment? Sir William Draper does himſelf but little honour in oppoſing the general ſenſe of his country. The people are ſeldom wrong in their *opinions*—in their ſentiments they are never miſtaken. There may be a vanity perhaps in a ſingular way of thinking—but when a man profeſſes a want of thoſe feelings, which do honour to the multitude, he hazards ſomething infinitely more important than the character of his underſtanding. After all, as Sir William may poſſibly be in earneſt in his anxiety for the D— of ——, I ſhould be glad to relieve him from it. He may reſt aſſured that this worthy nobleman laughs with equal indifference at *my* reproaches, and Sir William's diſtreſs about him. But here let it ſtop. Even the D— of ——, inſenſible as he is, will conſult the tranquility of his life, in not provoking the moderation of my temper. If, from the profoundeſt contempt, I ſhould ever riſe into anger, he ſhould ſoon find, that all I have already ſaid of him was lenity and compaſſion.

out

Out of a long catalogue, Sir William Draper has confined himſelf to the refutation of two charges only. The reſt he had not time to diſcuſs; and, indeed, it would have been a laborious undertaking. To draw up a defence of ſuch a ſeries of enormities, would have required a life at leaſt as long as that which has been uniformly employed in the practice of them. The public opinion of the D— of——'s extreme œconomy, is, it ſeems, entirely without foundation. Though not very prodigal abroad, in his own family at leaſt, he is regular and magnificent. He pays his debts, abhors a beggar, and makes a handſome proviſion for his ſon. His charity has improved upon the proverb, and ended where it began. Admitting the whole force of this ſingle inſtance of his domeſtic generoſity (wonderful indeed, conſidering the narrowneſs of his fortune, and the little merit of his only ſon) the Public may ſtill perhaps be diſſatisfied, and demand ſome other leſs equivocal proofs of his munificence. Sir William Draper ſhould have entered boldly into the detail—of indigence relieved;---of arts encouraged;---of ſcience patronized;---men of learning protected, and works of genius rewarded;---in ſhort, had there been a ſingle inſtance, beſides Mr. R---y, of bluſhing merit, brought forward by the Duke, for the ſervice of the public, it ſhould not have been omitted.

I wiſh it were poſſible to eſtabliſh my inference with the ſame certainty, on which I believe the principle is founded. My concluſion however was not drawn from the principle alone. I am not ſo unjuſt as to reaſon from one crime to another; though I think that, of all the vices avarice is moſt apt to taint and corrupt the heart. I combined the known temper of the man, with the extravagant conceſſions made by the Ambaſſador, and though I doubt not ſufficient care was taken to leave no document of any reaſonable negotiation, I ſtill maintain that the conduct

† of this Miniſter carries with it an internal and a convincing evidence againſt him. Sir William Draper ſeems not to know the value or force of ſuch a proof. He will not permit us to judge of the motives of Men, by the manifeſt tendency of their actions, nor by the notorious character of their minds.

He calls for papers and witneſſes with a ſort of triumphant ſecurity, as if nothing could be true, but what could be proved in a court of juſtice. Yet a religious man might have remembered, upon what foundation ſome truths, moſt intereſting to mankind, have been received and eſtabliſhed. If it were not for the internal evidence, which the pureſt of religions carries with it, what would have become of his once well quoted decalogue, and of the meekneſs of his chriſtianity?

The generous warmth of his reſentment makes him confound the order of events. He forgets that the inſults and diſtreſſes which the D. of ——— has ſuffered, and which Sir William has lamented with many delicate touches of the true pathetic, were only RECORDED in my letter to his Grace, not occaſioned by it. It was a ſimple, candid carrative of facts; though, for ought I know, it may carry with it ſomething prophetic. His Grace undoubtedly has received ſeveral ominous hints; and I think, in certain circumſtances, a wiſe man would do well to prepare himſelf for the event.

But I have a charge of a heavier nature againſt Sir William Draper. He tells us that the D. of —— is amenable to juſtice;—that parliament is a high and ſolemn tribunal; and that, if guilty, he may be puniſhed by due courſe of law; and all this he ſays with as much gravity, as if he believed one word of the matter.—I hope indeed the day of impeachments will arrive

† If Sir W. D. will take the trouble of looking into Torcy's Memoirs he will ſee with what little ceremony a bribe may be offered to a Duke, and with what little ceremony it was "only not accepted."

arrive, before this nobleman escapes out of life,—but to refer us to that mode of proceeding now, with such a ministry, and such a —— of C———s as the present, what is it, but an indecent mockery of the common sense of the nation? I think he might have contented himself with defending the greatest enemy, without insulting the distresses of his country.

His concluding declaration of his opinion with respect to the present condition of affairs, is too loose and undetermined to be of any service to the public. How strange it is that this gentleman should dedicate so much time and argument to the defence of worthless or indifferent characters, while he gives but seven solitary lines to the only subject, which can deserve his attention, or do credit to his abilities.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XVII.

SIR,

IT is not wonderful that the great Cauſe, in which this country is engaged, ſhould have rouſed and engroſſed the whole attention of the people. I rather admire the generous ſpirit with which they feel and aſſert their intereſt in this important queſtion, than blame them for their indifference about any other. When the conſtitution is openly invaded, when the firſt original right of the people, from which all laws derive their authority, is directly attacked, inferior grievances naturally loſe their force, and are ſuffered to paſs without puniſhment or obſervation: the preſent miniſtry are as ſingularly marked by their fortune, as by their crimes. Inſtead of atoning for their former conduct by any wiſe or popular meaſure, they have found, in the enormity of one fact, a cover and defence for a ſeries of meaſures, which muſt have been fatal to any other adminiſtration. I fear we are too remiſs in obſerving the whole of their proceedings. Struck with the principal figure, we do not ſufficiently mark in what manner the canvas is filled up. Yet ſurely it is not a leſs crime, nor leſs fatal in its conſequences, to encourage a flagrant breach of the law by a military force, than to make uſe of the forms of parliament to deſtroy the conſtitution. The miniſtry ſeem determined to give us a choice of difficulties, and if poſſible, to perplex us with the multitude of their offences. The expedi-

ent

ent is well worthy of the Duke of G———. But though he has preſerved a gradation and variety in his meaſures, we ſhould remember that the principle is uniform. Dictated by the ſame ſpirit, they deſerve the ſame attention.——The following fact tho' of the moſt alarming nature, has not yet been clearly ſtated to the public, nor have the conſequences of it been ſufficiently underſtood. Had I taken it up at an earlier period, I ſhould have been accuſed of an uncandid, malignant precipitation, as if I watched for an unfair advantage againſt the miniſtry, and would not allow them a reaſonable time to do their duty. They now ſtand without excuſe. Inſtead of employing the leiſure they have had, in a ſtrict examination of the offence, and puniſhing the offenders, they ſeem to have conſidered that indulgence as a ſecurity to them, that with a little time and management the whole affair might be buried in ſilence and utterly forgotten.

A Major General of the army is arreſted by the Sheriff's officers for a conſiderable debt. He perſuades them to conduct him to the Tilt-yard in St. James's-park, under ſome pretence of buſineſs, which it imported him to ſettle before he was confined. He applies to a ſerjeant, not immediately on duty to aſſiſt with ſome of his companions in favouring his eſcape. He attempts it. A buſtle enſues. The bailiffs claim their priſoner. An officer of the guards not then on duty, takes part in the affair, applies to the lieutenant commanding the Tilt-yard guard, and urges him to turn out his guard to relieve a General Officer. The lieutenant declines interfering in perſon, but ſtands at a diſtance and ſuffers the buſineſs to be done. The other officer takes upon himſelf to order out the guard. In a moment they are in arms, quit their guard, march, reſcue the General, and drive away the ſheriffs officers, who in vain repreſent their right to the priſoner

priſoner and the nature of the arreſt. The ſoldiers firſt conduct the General into their guard-room, then eſcort him to a place of ſafety, with bayonets fixed, and in all the forms of military triumph. I will not enlarge upon the various circumſtances, which attended this attrocious proceeding. The perſonal injury, received by the officers of the law in the execution of their duty, may perhaps be attoned for by ſome private compenſation. I conſider nothing but the wound, which has been given to the law itſelf, to which no remedy has been applied, no ſatisfaction made. Neither is it my deſign to dwell upon the miſconduct of the parties concerned, any farther than is neceſſary to ſhew the behaviour of the miniſtry in its true light. I would make every compaſſionate allowance for the infatuation of the priſoner, the falſe and criminal diſcretion of one officer, and the madneſs of another. I would leave the ignorant ſoldiers entirely out of the queſtion. They are certainly the leaſt guilty, though they are the only perſons who have yet ſuffered, even in the appearance of puniſhment. The fact itſelf, however attrocious, is not the principal point to be conſidered. It might have happened under a more regular government, and with guards better diſciplined than ours. The main queſtion is, in what manner have the miniſtry acted on this extraordinary occaſion. A General officer calls upon the king's own guard, then actually on duty, to reſcue him from the laws of his country; yet at this moment he is in a ſituation no worſe, than if he had not committed an offence equally enormous in a civil and military view.—A lieutenant upon duty deſignedly quits his guard, and ſuffers it to be drawn out by another officer, for a purpoſe which he well knew (as we may collect from an appearance of caution which only makes his behaviour the more criminal) to be in the higheſt

higheſt degree illegal. Has this gentleman been called to a court-martial to anſwer for his conduct? No. Has it been cenſured? No. Has it been in any ſhape enquired into? No.——— Another lieutenant, not upon duty, nor even in his regimentals, is daring enough to order out the King's guard, over which he had properly no command, and engages them in a violation of the laws of his country, perhaps the moſt ſingular and extravagant that ever was attempted.—— What puniſhment has HE ſuffered? Literally none. Suppoſing he ſhould be proſecuted at common law for the reſcue, will that circumſtance, from which the miniſtry can derive no merit, excuſe or juſtify their ſuffering ſo flagrant a breach of military diſcipline to paſs by unpuniſhed and unnoticed? Are they aware of the outrage offered to their Sovereign, when his own proper guard is ordered out, to ſtop, by main force, the execution of his laws! What are we to conclude from ſo ſcandalous a neglect of their duty, but that they have other views, which can only be anſwered by ſecuring the attachment of the guards: The miniſter would hardly be ſo cautious of offending them, if he did not mean, in due time, to call for their aſſiſtance.

With reſpect to the parties themſelves, let it be obſerved that theſe gentlemen are neither young officers, nor very young men. Had they belonged to the unfledged race of enſigns, who infeſt our ſtreets, and diſhonour our public places, it might perhaps be ſufficient to ſend them back to that diſcipline, from which their parents, judging lightly from the maturity of their vices, had removed them too ſoon. In this caſe I am ſorry to ſee, not ſo much the folly of youth, as the ſpirit of the corps, and the connivance of government. I do not queſtion that there are many brave and worthy officers in the

regiments of guards. But conſidering them as a corps, I fear it will be found that they are neither good ſoldiers nor good ſubjects. Far be it from me to inſinuate the moſt diſtant reflection upon the army. On the contrary, I honour and eſteem the profeſſion; and if thoſe gentlemen were better ſoldiers, I am ſure they would be better ſubjects. It is not that there is any internal vice or defect in the profeſſion itſelf, as regulated in this country, but that it is the ſpirit of this particular corps to deſpiſe their profeſſion, and that, while they vainly aſſume the lead of the army, they make it matter of impertinent compariſon and triumph over the braveſt troops in the world (I mean our marching regiments) that THEY indeed ſtand upon higher ground, and are privileged to neglect the labourious forms of military diſcipline and duty. Without dwelling longer upon a moſt invidious ſubject, I ſhall leave it to military men, who have ſeen a ſervice more active than the parade, to determine whether or no I ſpeak truth.

How far this dangerous ſpirit has been encouraged by government, and to what pernicious purpoſes it may be applied hereafter, well deſerves our moſt ſerious conſideration. I know indeed that, when this affair happened, an affectation of alarm ran through the miniſtry. Something muſt be done to ſave appearances. The caſe was too flagrant to be paſſed by abſolutely without notice. But how have they acted? Inſtead of ordering the officers concerned, and who, ſtrictly ſpeaking, are alone guilty, to be put under arreſt, and brought to a trial, they would have it underſtood that they did their duty compleatly, in confining a ſerjeant and four private ſoldiers, until they ſhould be demanded by the civil power; ſo that while the officers, who ordered or permitted the thing to be done, eſcaped without cenſure, the

poor men, who obeyed thoſe orders, who in a military view are no way reſponſible for what they did, and who for that reaſon have been diſcharged by the civil magiſtrate, are the only objects whom the miniſtry have thought proper to expoſe to puniſhment. They did not venture to bring even theſe men to a court-martial, becauſe they knew their evidence would be fatal to ſome perſons, whom *they* were determined to protect. Otherwiſe, I doubt not, the lives of theſe unhappy, friendleſs ſoldiers, would long ſince have been ſacrificed without ſcruple, to the ſecurity of their guilty officers.

I have been accuſed of endeavouring to inflame the paſſions of the people.—Let me now appeal to their underſtanding. If there be any tool of adminiſtration daring enough to deny theſe facts, or ſhameleſs enough to defend the conduct of the miniſtry, let him come forward. I care not under what title he appears: he ſhall find me ready to maintain the truth of my narrative, and the juſtice of my obſervations upon it, at the hazard of my utmoſt credit with the public.

Under the moſt arbitrary governments, the common adminiſtration of juſtice is ſuffered to take its courſe. The ſubject, though robbed of his ſhare in the legiſlature, is ſtill protected by the laws. The political freedom of the Engliſh conſtitution was once the pride and honour of an Engliſhman. The civil equality of the laws preſerved the property, and defended the ſafety of the ſubject. Are theſe glorious privileges the birthright of the people, or are we only tenants at the will of the miniſtry?—But that I know there is a ſpirit of reſiſtance in the hearts of my countrymen, that they value life, not by its conveniencies, but by the independence and dignity of their condition, I ſhould, at this moment, appeal only to their diſcretion. I ſhould perſuade them to baniſh from their minds all memory of what we were,

were; I ſhould tell them this is not a time to remember that we were Engliſhmen; and give it as my laſt advice, to make ſome early agreement with the miniſter, that ſince it has pleaſed him to rob us of thoſe political rights, which once diſtinguiſhed the inhabitants of a country, where honour was happineſs, he would leave us at leaſt the humble, obedient ſecurity of citizens, and graciouſly condeſcend to protect us in our ſubmiſſion.

JUNIUS.

FINIS.

15 JY 64